Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-193
Friday
4 October 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-193 4 October 1991

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

NOTICE TO READERS: The United States Government recognizes the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Arms Control & Disarmament

Gen Ladygin: U.S. Plan 'Step in Right Direction' *[Moscow TV]* 1
Petrovskiy: No 'Closed' Disarmament Topics *[TRUD 1 Oct]* 1
Bovin Calls Nuclear-Free World 'Utopian' *[IZVESTIYA 4 Oct]* 1
'Point of View' Program Examines Bush Proposal *[Moscow Radio]* 2
Disarmament Expert Evaluates U.S. Initiatives *[Budapest NEPSZABADSAG 1 Oct]* 6
U.S. Plan Renders Nuclear War 'Virtually Impossible' *[TASS]* 7
Arguments for Total Nuclear Test Ban Examined *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 27 Sep]* 7

Worldwide Issues

CSCE Conference Approves Final Document *[TASS]* 9

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, U.S. Jewish Advocate View Emigration *[IZVESTIYA 4 Oct]* 10
Gates Testimony to Senate Panel Reported *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 10

East Europe

Pankin on Signing of CSFR Friendship Treaty *[TASS]* 11
Views 'Radical' Changes in Relations *[TASS]* 12
Slovakia Demands 'Passed Over' in CSFR Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 12
Foreign Ministry Reaffirms Position on Yugoslavia *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 12
Miners' Use of Force in Romania Deplored *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 13
IZVESTIYA Views Future of Ethnic Poles *[3 Oct]* 13

West Europe

Gorbachev, Kohl Cheer German Unity, 'New Era' *[Moscow TV]* 14
Gorbachev Answers Media Questions *[Moscow TV]* 15
Gosteleradio 'Can Count On' Italian Aid *[IZVESTIYA 1 Oct]* 16

Latin America & Caribbean

Foreign Ministry Condemns Haitian Coup *[TASS]* 16
Cuban Emigrants Comment on Castro Regime *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 17

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Gorbachev Decree Postpones Supreme Soviet Session *[TASS]* 19

Political & Social

Coup Investigators Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 19
Committee Silent About Work *[TASS]* 19
Closed Trial for Putchists Probable *[INTERFAX]* 20
Primakov on Relations With Baltic Secret Services *[BALTFAX]* 20
Ousted Foreign Intelligence Chief Interviewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 20
CPSU's Ivashko on Party's Current Status *[PRAVDA 30 Sep]* 23

Media & Journalism

Journalist Bemoans Failure of TASS Reform *[ROSSISKAYA GAZETA 27 Sep]* 26
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's New Backer *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 27
TASS Reviews 4 Oct Central Press 29

Economic

Leaders Comment on Results of Alma-Ata Meeting 29
Silayev Interviewed *[Russian TV]* 29
Yavlinskiy, Others Cited *[IZVESTIYA 3 Oct]* 31
Nazarbayev News Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Oct]* 32
Snegur, Karimov Assess Results *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Oct]* 32
Eight Republics Sign Statement *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Oct]* 34
Economic Committee Views Republics' Cooperation *[Moscow Radio]* 34
Operational Committee Discusses Nuclear Industry *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 34
Abalkin Reports Fivefold Increase in Deficit *[Russian TV]* 35
Economic Committee Drafts Food Agreement *[TASS]* 35
Ten Republics To Sign *[INTERFAX]* 35
First Cellular Telephone System Launched *[Moscow TV]* 36

Military

General Staff Reacts Positively to Bush Proposals *[Moscow International]* 36
Shaposhnikov: 3 Million 'Reasonable' Troop Level *[Paris TV]* 36
Ministry Confirms 27 Sep Submarine Accident *[TASS]* 37
Statement on Accident *[TASS]* 37
Reporter Views Accident *[Moscow Radio]* 37
Northern Fleet Crews Prepare Strike Action *[TASS]* 37
Conscription Decree Delay Causing 'Confusion' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 38
Gorbachev Issues Decree *[Moscow TV]* 38
Defense Commission Announces Start of Reforms *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Sep]* 39
Deputy Defense Minister Rodionov Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Oct]* 40
Career of New Moscow Air Defense Chief Outlined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Sep]* 41
Military Stockpiles of Food for Winter Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Oct]* 42
Summary of Military Help With Harvest *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Oct]* 42

BALTIC COUNTRIES

Estonia

Savisaar, Shaposhnikov Discuss Soviet Troops *[BALTFAX]* 43
Reach Agreement on Troop Pullout *[BALTFAX]* 43
Plans To Issue Identity Document Noted *[TASS]* 43
Officials Comment on Nascent Intelligence Service *[BALTFAX]* 44
Decree Restricts Use of Strategic Reserves *[BALTFAX]* 44

Latvia

Yakovlev, Moscow Delegate Hold Preliminary Talks *[TASS]* 44
Discuss Economic Issues, Troops *[BALTFAX]* 45
Identify Future Bilateral Agenda *[TASS]* 45

Godmanis Reaffirms Economic Linkage Intention *[BALTFAX]* 45
Rejects Economic 'Union' *[Riga International]* 45
USSR Parliamentary Representation Ceases *[TASS]* 45
Mutual Trade Issues Discussed With Moldova *[BALTFAX]* 46
Supreme Council Debates Citizenship Question *[TASS]* 46
Volunteer People's Front Detachments Dissolved *[BALTFAX]* 46
Defense Ministry To Be Formed by 1 Nov *[BALTFAX]* 46
Protestors Demand Rubik's Release *[BALTFAX]* 46
Foreign Exchange Reserves Total $3.4 Million *[BALTFAX]* 47

Lithuania

Supreme Council Moves To Reorganize Government *[BALTFAX]* 47
Legislator Views Problems in Talks With USSR *[TASS]* 47
Negotiating Team Unchanged *[BALTFAX]* 47
Vilnius Seeks City Boundary Expansion *[PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 47
Privatization Campaign Progress Reported *[BALTFAX]* 47

RSFSR

Supreme Soviet

More on Burbulis Remarks at Fourth Session *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 3 Oct]* 48

Federation Affairs

Yeltsin Visited by Burbulis, Saburov in Sochi *[INTERFAX]* 48
Yeltsin Used Catholic Transmitter During Coup *[AFP]* 48
Council of Ministers Examines Economic Treaty *[Radio Rossii]* 49
Khasbulatov Says Burbulis, Shakhray Should Resign *[INTERFAX]* 49
Deputies Support Rutskoy for Prime Minister *[Radio Rossii]* 49
Rutskoy Explains DPCR's Emergence, Aims, Tasks *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Oct]* 49
Republic To Protect Rights of Russians *[IZVESTIYA 2 Oct]* 51
MVD Chief Murashov Briefs Press on Expectations *[Russian TV]* 51
Chief State Inspector Makharadze Interviewed *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Oct]* 52
Congress of 'Patriotic Forces' Proposed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Sep]* 54
'Viewpoint' Poll on Russia's Allies Within Union *[INTERFAX]* 56
KGB Chairman Says Emphasis on Fighting Crime *[Moscow TV]* 56
KGB Analyst: Situation 'Worse' Than Before Coup *[Radio Rossii]* 57
Filshin To Head Economic Relations Ministry *[INTERFAX]* 57
Economic Council Chairman Comments on Resignation *[PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 57
Exchange Bank Plans To Increase Capital Base *[INTERFAX]* 58
N. Fleet Vessel Staff Considering Strike *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Soldiers' Mothers Strike for Removal of Official *[INTERFAX]* 58

Local Affairs

Yeltsin Meets With Krasnodar Administration Head *[Moscow Radio]* 59
Gomel City Soviet Elects Non-CPSU Chairman *[IZVESTIYA 30 Sep]* 59
Negotiated Settlement of Dnestr Conflict Urged *[IZVESTIYA 2 Oct]* 59
Kemerovo Democratic Bloc Members Hold Meeting *[Radio Rossii]* 59
N. Ossetia Supreme Soviet Discusses Border Issue *[Moscow Radio]* 59
Labor Alliance Organization Registered in Siberia *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 59
Tatar CPSU Members Aim To Obtain Sovereignty 60
New Socialist Party Proposed *[PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 60
Democrats To Hold 1st Congress *[INTERFAX]* 60
President Sets Up State Council *[INTERFAX]* 60
Paramilitary Volunteer Force Created *[INTERFAX]* 60
Vladivostok Open to Foreigners; Poses Problems *[Moscow TV]* 61
Struggling Railcar Project Seeks Business Backers *[Moscow TV]* 61

External Affairs

Sobchak To Help Normalize Tajik Situation *[Radio Rossii]* 61
Left Centrists Urge Name Change, Join NATO *[INTERFAX]* 61

Media

Newspaper Editors Picket Press Ministry *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Sverdlovsk Asked To Discontinue Publication *[Moscow Radio]* 62

International Affairs

Rutskoy Holds Talks With Afgan Prime Minister 62
Khaleqyar 'Satisfied' With Results *[TASS]* 62
Efforts for Settlement Viewed *[TASS]* 62
Envoy Comments on Relations *[INTERFAX]* 63
Lack of Funding Threatens Kola Peninsula Project *[Russian TV]* 63
Reform Group Issues Communique With SDS *[Sofia Radio]* 63

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Interregional

Republic Officials Comment on Nuclear Weapons *[Russian TV]* 64

Belorussia

Idea of Becoming EC Associate Member Explored *[INTERFAX]* 64

Ukraine

Defense Minister on Army, Nuclear Weapons *[TASS]* 64
Draft Decision Worked Out on Defense Council *[INTERFAX]* 65
Crimea Seeks To Leave Ukraine, Rejoin Russia 65
Rally Held in Sevastopol *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Oct]* 65
Crimean Question Discussed *[Russian TV]* 65
Supreme Soviet Leader Kravchuk Continues Tour 65
Contacts U.S. Business Circles *[Kiev Radio]* 65
Working Visit to France *[INTERFAX]* 66
Seeks Cooperation in Engineering *[TASS]* 66
Talks With Mitterrand *[AFP]* 66
Views on Independence, Presidential Candidates 67
Poll Favors Union of Independent States *[Kiev Radio]* 67
Odessa Opposes Independence *[Kiev International]* 67
Rukh Leader: Need to Accelerate *[PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 67
Possibility of 'Spontaneous Strike Disturbances' *[Kiev Radio]* 67
Law on Environmental Protection *[cross-reference]* 67
Law on Enterprise Tax Law *[cross-reference]* 67
Law on Income Taxes *[cross-reference]* 67

Moldova

Republic Renounces Payments on USSR Foreign Debt *[AFP]* 68
Liberation Via 'Unification With the Motherland' *[Bucharest DREPTATEA 26 Sep]* 68
Law on Citizenship *[cross-reference]* 68
Law on National Bank *[cross-reference]* 68
Law on Bank Activities *[cross-reference]* 68

CAUCASUS

Georgia

Opposition Guards Withdrawal From Tbilisi Settled *[INTERFAX]* 69
'Joint Accord' on Withdrawal *[Moscow TV]* 69
'Tension' Mounts, Deadline Passes *[TASS]* 69
National Guards Leave Positions *[INTERFAX]* 69
Opposition Units To Remain in Tbilisi *[TASS]* 70
Opposition Representatives Hold News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 70
Gamsakhurdia To Convene Parliament 'Soon' *[AFP]* 70
Gamsakhurdia Calls For Reconciliation *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 27 Sep]* 71
Supreme Council 20 Sep Session Reported *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 21 Sep]* 72
South Ossetian Situation Updated *[INTERFAX]* 74
Republic KGB Deputy Chairman Relieved of Duties *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 18 Sep]* ... 75
Deputy Trade Minister Replaced *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 21 Sep]* 75

Armenia

Ter-Petrosyan Heads Delegation to Kazakhstan *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Oct]* 75
Azerbaijan Seeking 'To Wreck' Mediation Process *[TASS]* 75
Dwindling Fuel Reserves, Energy Shortage Noted *[Moscow TV]* 75

Azerbaijan

Mutalibov Holds Talks With Opposition Leaders *[Russian TV]* 76
Opposition Members Join Defense Council *[IZVESTIYA 1 Oct]* 76
Reportage on Nagorno-Karabakh Clashes, Developments 76
Army 'Not Involved' in Shelling *[INTERFAX]* 76
20 Killed Since Zheleznovodsk Accord *[TASS]* 76
Deteriorating Living Conditions Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Civilian, OMON Casualties Noted *[INTERFAX]* 77

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev on Alma-Ata Economic Meeting Results *[INTERFAX]* 78
Trade Accords Signed With Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan *[Moscow TV]* 78
Nazarbayev, Austrian Chancellor on Cooperation *[TASS]* 78
Semipalatinsk To Become Science, Production Center *[IZVESTIYA 1 Oct]* 78

Kyrgyzstan

UN Experts To Issue Recommendations on Economy *[INTERFAX]* 79
Akayev Promises 'Freedom of Conscience' Bill *[INTERFAX]* 80
Law on Local Self Government *[cross-reference]* 80
Law on Environmental Protection *[cross-reference]* 80

Tajikistan

Supreme Soviet Extraordinary Session Concludes 80
Rejects Nabiyev Resignation *[Moscow International]* 80
Suspends Communist Party *[TASS]* 80
Rejects Demand To Disband *[Moscow TV]* 81
Workers Support Supreme Soviet *[Dushanbe Radio]* 81

Turkmenia

Democratic Party Official Opposes Referendum *[INTERFAX]* 81
Indebture, Reserves, Resources Discussed *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 81
Regulations Simplified at Border With Iran *[INTERFAX]* 82

Uzbekistan

Legislators Split on No Confidence Measure *[Moscow TV]* 82
Karimov Deliberates Implications of Independence *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 30 Sep]* 83
Defense Minister Interviewed on Republic Army *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Sep]* 84
Production Slump Hits One-Third of Enterprises *[INTERFAX]* 85
Grain Exports Contribute to Bread Shortage *[INTERFAX]* 85

Arms Control & Disarmament

Gen Ladygin: U.S. Plan 'Step in Right Direction'

LD0310210191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Remarks by Lieutenant General Fedor Ladygin, chief of the Treaty and Legal Directorate of the USSR General Staff at the USSR Defense Ministry in Moscow; date not given; from the "TV Inform" newscast—recorded]

[Text] The United States initiative on scrapping short-range nuclear weapons remains one the leading subjects, if not the leading one, in the news. Politicians and diplomats are working on it while economists are analyzing it. So what does the Soviet military think about President Bush's proposals? We went to the USSR Defense Ministry to ask this question.

[Ladygin] The range of measures put forward by the United States President for reduction of nuclear weapons is a step in the right direction. Overall, they accord with the 1986 Soviet statement on a comprehensive program for scrapping nuclear weapons. Many times, we proposed reductions and elimination of nuclear arms in Europe. Judging by President Bush's statement, the need for that has now been realized by the United States as well. A number of the proposals put forward by President Bush accord with the written agreement jointly signed by the presidents of the USSR and the United States on 1 July 1990 regarding future negotiations on nuclear space weapons and further measures to strengthen strategic stability. Naturally, we welcome the United States's abandoning of certain strategic programs. At the same time, as stated by President Bush, the United States will decisively continue to follow the program for the modernization of strategic weapons, including the Strategic Defense Initiative, in creating a widescale anti-missile defense system, something which, as we deeply feel, contravenes the aims of the 1972 agreement on anti-missile defense. Still, we are prepared to move jointly with the United States and other nuclear powers down the path of ridding mankind of nuclear weapons.

Petrovskiy: No 'Closed' Disarmament Topics

92UF0026A Moscow TRUD in Russian 1 Oct 91 p 3

[Article by E. Alekseyev: "New Perspectives Opening Up"]

[Text] Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs, has given a high appraisal to the initiatives advanced by U.S. President G. Bush in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. On 30 September he appeared before Soviet and foreign journalists at the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and emphasized the unconditional readiness of our country to embark upon "actions comparable in significance," to cooperate with the United States on the path to full rejection, in the final analysis, of nuclear arsenals. And V. Petrovskiy made note of the following remarkable detail—prior to his television appearance, G. Bush gave preliminary notification of his proposals not only to the closest allies of the United States, but to USSR President M. Gorbachev and Russian President B. Yeltsin as well.

Petrovskiy stated that the Soviet side was prepared to immediately and constructively examine all of G. Bush's proposals. In this regard, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Boris Pankin, being in the United States, has already made direct contact with Secretary of State J. Baker. USSR Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Aleksey Obukhov will fly to the United States during the first 10 days of October to continue these contacts.

Once again it was noted that the Soviet side will enter into dialogue without delay regarding all matters of nuclear disarmament touched upon. There exist no "closed" topics here.

Coordination of Union and republic positions will be effected on all questions.

Bovin Calls Nuclear-Free World 'Utopian'

PM0310223091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Oct 91 Union Edition p 6

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Nuclear Disarmament—From Utopia to Politics"]

[Text] Last week U.S. President G. Bush came up with far-reaching proposals to cut the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals. In my view, the G. Bush proposals should be adopted in principle. And we should immediately start talks to clarify some uncertainties, specify some details, and avoid any pitfalls.

At the same time, it would be useful to return to the overall concept of nuclear disarmament once proposed by the Soviet Union. I am referring to the idea of phased progress toward a "nuclear-free world"—which has again been mentioned in connection with the G. Bush initiatives. "Nuclear-free world..." Those words are so familiar and have been said so often that we hardly seem to notice them. Yet they really provide food for thought. Thought about whether the total and universal elimination of nuclear weapons is realistic and in line with the country's security interests.

Let's think about it.

One obvious positive result of perestroyka is the gradual way in which our awareness has been cleansed and freed of all kinds of illusory, mythological ideas about ourselves and the outside world. We have gotten rid of all the chimeras, utopian ideas, and false orientations which had led us into a dead end. This process of spiritual self-cleansing is difficult and hard—we have grown so accustomed to soothing, reassuring, and simplistic

mirages. And yet things are moving; both our awareness, our world view, and our behavior are changing and becoming more realistic.

If we look at our behavior in the international arena and our approach to foreign policy tasks, it seems that, when analyzing military-strategic parity, we have already given up comparing our potential with that of the rest of the world. We seem to have realized that our officers and men have no business either in Afghanistan or indeed in Ethiopia, Iraq, Cuba, and Nicaragua. Judging by everything, we have finally grasped—if not completely as yet—that the demands for verification, transparency, "open skies," and so forth, which the Americans were always pressing upon us, are entirely natural and necessary.

And now, in my view, we are mature enough—or are becoming mature enough—to tell ourselves and our partners that total nuclear disarmament is impractical, at least within the visible historical horizon. The vision of a nuclear-free world by the year 2000—or by the year 2017—is nothing more than a typical case of utopia.

And a harmful and dangerous kind of utopia. I fear that if we remove and scrap our nuclear weapons, thereby abandoning the nuclear deterrent, we will feel highly uncomfortable. Or we will lay ourselves open to pre-nuclear level military adventures.

A few years ago I used up quite a lot of time and paper demonstrating the opposite—finding arguments to confirm the possibility that nuclear potentials could be destroyed by the year 2000. Analyzing those arguments now, I can see that they in turn were based on a general and, once again, utopian premise. It was assumed that in the next 10-15 years the entire system of international relations would be fundamentally renewed, democratized, and demilitarized—which would create the conditions for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

This premise was clearly false. And this should indeed have been realized even when the USSR was submitting its latest proposals on universal and total disarmament to the United Nations. All the more so when M.S. Gorbachev's famous statement was published. But the ingrained habit of supporting the leadership's words and actions, the majesty and humanity of the goal, and, ultimately, our own desire to rid ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren of the nuclear threat forever all militated against a strictly scientific and sober analysis free of any deforming influences.

Now there are far fewer obstacles. And we have gotten a bit smarter too. At the end of the 20th century and for a long time to come we will be surrounded by an extremely contradictory, turbulent, and rapidly changing world whose surprises will not always be nice ones. Strengthening the potential for mutual trust between ourselves and the West, and eradicating many conflict situations could indeed—as the East Europe experience and our own experience demonstrate—be accompanied by the emergence of new conflicts and "hot spots." It is still hard to say anything definite about the future foreign policy of the new great powers of the 21st century (South Africa or Brazil, for instance, Indonesia or India), much less about the powers striving to match them (Iraq, say, or Iran). Under these circumstances, I repeat, the nuclear security guarantee will not be out of place.

Moreover, everything indicates that there is no chance of "persuading" the United States, the PRC, Britain, and France to eliminate their own nuclear arsenals. No chance. Consequently, strategic nuclear weapons—unlike tactical weapons (although there are questions about this too)—will remain in service for a long time to come.

I share the opinion of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Foreign Minister A. Kozyrev that we should remove the thesis of the need for nuclear disarmament and ignore the achievement of a nuclear-free world as a practical task for our foreign policy. The real task is to create conditions in which nuclear weapons will never be used.

It would be useful to discuss with the Americans the question of what could be the minimum nuclear deterrent (given the ideas of "unacceptable damage," the potential of ABM defenses, the existence of nuclear weapons in the hands of third powers, the chain reaction of uncontrollable consequences, and so forth).

Obviously, if a weapon exists it will inevitably be improved. A ban on modernization is unrealistic. What is realistic is an agreement which would lay down stringent and verifiable rules for modernization. Hence it follows that an end to nuclear testing is just as utopian as a complete ban on nuclear weapons. Testing should continue. But we can and must agree to reduce threshold yields [porogovaya moshchnost] and cut the number of tests. Given the current and growing level of mutual trust it is entirely possible to imagine groups of inspectors attending tests, or even joint use of test ranges.

In general, mankind will live in the nuclear world for a long time to come. But a ramified system of mutual commitments between the nuclear powers could make that life more peaceful. To claim that anything more is possible would be to deceive ourselves and others.

It seems to me that against this conceptual backdrop it will be easier to hold businesslike talks geared to real results with the Americans—and not only with them. Against this backdrop preventing nuclear nonproliferation becomes of particular, prime importance. That is the main danger.

'Point of View' Program Examines Bush Proposal

LD0310184891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1330 GMT 3 Oct 91

["Point of View" program, hosted by Viktor Levin, with Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, adviser to USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Levin] The theme of our conversation today is the U.S. President's initiative aimed at making considerable reductions in nuclear armaments; the significance of this proposal; what may come of all of this in the end, or at least in the foreseeable future; and the most important thing, it seems to me, or at least a very important thing—to determine why this initiative became possible.

Taking part in our broadcast today is Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, adviser to USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and I will address my first question to him: What made this unilateral step by the U.S. President possible in our world and why did it take place at this time?

[Zagladin] Viktor Nikolayevich, may I broaden your question by adding one more word and making the question read possible and essential?

[Levin] I am happy to accept that.

[Zagladin] This is the point: Bush's initiative is, on the one hand, a continuation of the long-term logic of the development of our relations with the United States and those debates and discussions that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush have held between them of late. When the treaty on strategic offensive weapons had been signed, the question then naturally arose of what was to happen next. This subject was discussed in conversations, letters, and telephone calls. The intentions to move forward did exist and still do, both in connection with strategic offensive weapons and tactical nuclear weapons.

Let me continue: In practice, there have recently been discussions on how to approach tactical nuclear weapons—to carry out unilateral reductions, or to conclude some sort of overall agreement, taking into account the fact that several states possess these weapons. So this was not something totally unexpected but the continuation of a certain logic. This logic—our gradual movement along the path of really reducing nuclear weapons—made this initiative possible.

But I think the proposal was made essential by other circumstances. I think that events in our country—in particular the 19 August coup d'etat, which panicked many Western politicians who were aware of the danger of the situation which could arise if our nuclear weapons got out of control or fell into the hands of various, including possibly irresponsible, elements—played a very great role.

[Levin] Our military men and our defense minister assert that there was no possibility of this danger developing, but nevertheless the situation itself gave reason for this problem to be discussed and for some serious thinking.

[Zagladin] And you know, Viktor Nikolayevich, in the West, in particular DIE ZEIT carried a long article which gave details, on the basis of conversations with our military men, of what measures were taken, what was done, and how it was done. It caused serious anxiety. It caused serious anxiety and raised the question of how one could protect oneself from such things. Well, OK, appropriate additional measures are being taken in our country to control them, but the situation is 100-percent effective in terms of strategic weapons because they are in the hands of a single command and are reliably defended, stored, and so on. Tactical nuclear assets are, naturally, in the arsenals of individual units and formations. There, of course, control is not so strict.

[Levin] Consequently, they are at the disposal of the commander of the particular unit, to a certain extent at least.

[Zagladin] To a certain extent, yes, because naturally the overall command to use nuclear weapons is not issued by the commander of a unit, but from that point on he has greater freedom of initiative, if you would.

It was apparently these circumstances which made people give this some thought. The actual direction of the thinking had been set earlier because the ideas already existed. But the question was how to do it. And here, I think, the U.S. President and his close entourage—because this question was considered and discussed in a very small circle—came to the conclusion that it was possible to take such a step.

It was possible because there is virtually no danger of war between us and the United States now, and practically no danger of nuclear war in general. There is no intention of attacking each other. On the other hand, there is a real need to reduce the risk of uncontrolled actions or events which could give rise to the unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons. I think this is the reason which made this initiative essential for Bush.

[Levin] Is it also essential for us? That question is also coming up.

[Zagladin] I think it is, for the simple reason that, first, we ourselves announced the idea of a nuclear-free world. That is our strategic long-term goal. And such a major step in this direction is in full accord with our interests and our intentions. Second, if we now intend to carry out a reform of the Army—and this is already actively under way, as the draft has already been handed to the Supreme Soviet. [sentence as heard] In connection with a reduction in the numerical size of the Army, there will be a reduction in the number of weapons. Therefore we ourselves should have raised the question of the need to reduce nuclear weapons, including tactical ones, since strategic weapons fall under the bilateral treaties signed with the Americans.

Third, there was also the problem of the development of events in the Union and instability in certain regions where this tactical nuclear weaponry is located. This question also came up. Therefore it is natural that our president immediately gave a positive assessment of this idea. In general some of our thoughts have already been

elaborated on how specifically and within what timetable we could respond to it.

[Levin] Vadim Valentinovich, what you are saying explains very much of the behavior of the United States and the reaction, the first reaction, of the Soviet Union. Don't you think that to a certain extent—if not to a decisive extent—that such a step by the Americans became possible as a result of the serious changes for the better in the international atmosphere as a whole—the implementation of the policy of new thinking and those changes? You said no one intends to attack anyone, and evidently this is the key phrase in the present international situation.

[Zagladin] You are right, Viktor Nikolayevich. I was simply trying to say the same thing using different words when I spoke about the logic of our talks, about the progress along the path of nuclear disarmament.

[Levin] I was simply following old habits and wanted you to say more about our initiatives. [both laugh]

[Zagladin] You know, as far as our initiatives are concerned, they played a major role in this matter, too, because the most important thing today, in these days as Bush's idea is being discussed, is that one is particularly reminded about the initiative made in January 1986 for a nuclear-free world. At that time the Americans totally rejected it. But now Bush himself is gradually coming to the same conclusion and he is moving in that direction, although of course there are still some major stockpiles of nuclear weapons left. So you are right about our initiatives. They played a major role.

But speaking frankly there is something I regret: that this initiative was not put forward by us.

[Levin] The thing I like about the answers Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave to the questions from his press aide—which were made public in his television interview immediately after the announcement of Bush's initiative—what I liked was that Mikhail Sergeyevich said: We will equalize the tally. He let it be understood—or at least this is how I understood it—that in the final analysis it is not so important who took a particular step first, since the very logic of events, the logic of the development of bilateral events from Reykjavik to Malta and so on and so on—and in this list there are, of course, other events. [sentence as heard]

Our broadcast is being aired on a very noteworthy day, the first anniversary of German unification. Many people in our country—I would not say they were ill-intentioned, perhaps they were sincere—considered and perhaps still believe that the unification of Germany creates a threat to us. [passage omitted]

[Levin] It is still possible for our side to put forward initiatives.

[Zagladin] Undoubtedly, and all the more so since in his appearance on television Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke about the banning of nuclear tests. That is also a considerable issue. As far as can be understood from the latest contacts with leaders of other Western countries who were in Moscow, in general the majority of them are very sympathetic toward an initiative to halt nuclear tests. So this issue is cooking, as the saying goes. It is still cooking. It is not yet cooked, but it is cooking.

[Levin] Were these people who do not possess nuclear weapons, or do they include some who possess nuclear weapons?

[Zagladin] Both, including those who have them on their territory and those who possess them. In general, this matter is gradually coming to maturity, but of course it will still take time.

But as far as Germany is concerned, I agree with you that the past year in itself has dispelled the fears that had been expressed. [passage omitted]

[Levin] Vadim Valentinovich, returning to the issue of nuclear weapons, I would also like to touch upon the issue of a nonproliferation regime. In my view this is now becoming even more important. We really have concluded a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive nuclear arms with the Americans. We are moving toward the elimination of tactical nuclear arms. Medium- and short-range missiles have already been eliminated. The nuclear superpowers are moving, without rushing, at a fairly steady pace, but at the same time consistently toward a significant reduction in their nuclear potential. This reduction is so significant that at this time the concept of a nonnuclear world is already taking on a fairly solid outline.

Along with this, there is "x" number of so-called near nuclear powers and there are, to put it delicately, one or two nuclear powers which are saying...well, let us wait. Things have not yet reached us. One can understand them to a certain extent, but if they are planning at some point to join in, then the issue here is purely technical in nature. But those near-nuclear powers—this is a most alarming situation.

[Zagladin] Yes, absolutely. This, by the way, is an issue which has been discussed for some time now. It has been discussed within the framework of our bilateral negotiations, including talks with the United States, Great Britain, the FRG, Italy, and France. This issue is worrying everyone now, especially in light of the Gulf crisis and the discoveries which are being made in Iraq. This topic is also being discussed at NATO. Specifically they are discussing what kinds of measures can be taken to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the technologies which can be used for their production.

A serious discussion is under way, and the problem itself is very significant. But nonnuclear powers sometimes use the following arguments: You are telling us all this, but you yourselves have the weapons and will not let us have them. So it is as if there is an element here of not enjoying equal rights. Well, I generally do not accept this

argument because it is not possible to measure the equal rights of states by the presence of the means of destruction for the planet. The equality of rights which we want to achieve lies in the absence of these means. I think that in this sense our Soviet- American process of reducing nuclear weapons and George Bush's initiative are the arguments which prove to near-nuclear powers and those who aspire to be one that our intentions are serious and that we are indeed planning to embark upon this path, in other words not to increase but to cut them to the minimum.

By the way, proceeding from the same initiative put forward by the U.S. President, in the United States itself some very influential people, including Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate committee on nuclear issues [as heard], and Defense Secretary Richard Cheney, are saying that we should think about further immediate cuts in strategic weapons. It is through these intentions of ours that we can really prove that we want to go in this direction. If, by the way, we managed to agree on nuclear testing, it would be one more step in the direction of showing our good intentions, the intentions of the present nuclear club, and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, because naturally it is difficult to create a weapon without tests.

[Levin] Vadim Valentinovich, for a number of years at arms control negotiations—as they called them—the Americans have been putting this issue like this: trust first and then disarmament. We were saying disarmament itself would lead to trust. But now we are enjoying trust and disarmament is taking place. How would you assess the trust factor in the present development of Soviet-U.S. relations, first and foremost, and relations between the Soviet Union and other nuclear powers as a whole?

[Zagladin] Yes, I think that this used to be and continues to be an extremely important factor. If we were to look back to the past, literally for just a minute, we would remember that our first significant initiative, which came out in 1985-1986, was received with a certain amount of skepticism in the West. It was not because of their contents. Some people thought that a plan to get rid of all nuclear states was utopian.

But other proposals were received with skepticism because our initiatives began to be trusted only after we withdrew our troops from Afghanistan, showed real respect for our eastern [as heard] neighbors, and so on and so forth. So generally speaking, trust developed on the basis of actions, and this affected the process of destruction, without a doubt.

In the future this process of trust, of strengthening trust, and the process of expanding the atmosphere of trust should be just as significant, because even with all the trust that exists now—and even the partnership about which we are speaking nowadays—some elements of distrust still exist. They continue to exist in political circles to some extent, and especially in public opinion. This factor cannot be disregarded. Take the fears expressed in our own public opinions regarding Germany and the comments published by some of our newspapers which were almost suspicious of President Bush's proposals. All this speaks to the fact that distrust continues to exist, and politicians cannot come to terms with this fact.

The same issue exists in the United States. It may sound like a paradox but at present there is perhaps less distrust in the United States toward us than there is in our country toward them.

[Levin] Perhaps they have a broader view of the world, or it may be that they were blinded less by the old propaganda framework. They had the opportunity to consider a broader spectrum of information.

[Zagladin] That is true, but everyone was misled. Let us not hide this fact from ourselves. The fact that each side was misled helped to ensure that the other side was misled. That was a reciprocal process. But now, on the contrary, the process of eliminating these blinders is under way. But I am speaking about deepening and broadening the atmosphere of trust. Why? Because, well, take something as simple as this: Disarmament has begun. The Cocom [Coordinating Committe for Multilateral Export Controls] restrictions are being dealt with; they are gradually being removed. But this is proceeding slowly. Why? Because distrust still exists. They ask: What if this is used to create some new death-dealing weapon?

[Levin] Excuse me for interrupting, Vadim Valentinovich, but do you think the stumbling block in Cocom [Coordinating Committe for Multilateral Export Controls] is not economic—not the fear of giving a potential competitor some technology which could then be used to the detriment of the party who gave the technology—but precisely the issue of the military threat, or military distrust?

[Zagladin] You know, as far as we are concerned, I think military mistrust is still playing a part. We still have a very long way to go before becoming a country that can compete with the United States.

[Levin] Let us hope it does happen at some point!

[Zagladin] We will get there. As far as the other aspect of the matter is concerned, the Cocom instruments have sometimes been used and continue to be used by the United States to battle Western competitors. I could give you a list of contracts which would have been very advantageous to us and France, Belgium, Italy, and West Germany, for instance, but which could not be concluded because of Cocom restrictions. These are deals worth hundreds of millions [not further specified]. I will not give you the list now, it would take too long.

So there is this aspect of the matter, but it does not for the moment affect what we are talking about. Coming back to the issue of trust: Trust is something that must of

course be applied more broadly in the economic sphere as well. What is holding things back here? It is said that no one has the money we need. That is true, generally speaking, but the main point is not that we need money now. We need something quite different. We need stimuli for the development of our economy—not just a cash stimulus, but also the knowhow, organizational stimuli, and so forth. It is not the shortage of cash that is holding things up but rather distrust over what is happening in our country, the level of stability, and the ability of our economic organism to survive. Here the restoration of trust depends on us ourselves. I have already said that in the spheres of foreign policy and disarmament trust was born from action. It is exactly the same in all other areas, including the economy. So trust must increase. But to that end we have to work inside the country, and we also need new action in the international arena.

[Levin] Vadim Valentinovich, a final question. How do you think the implementation of these Bush initiatives and our own probable response will influence stabilization inside the country, above all economic stabilization?

[Zagladin] You know, as far as stabilization in general is concerned, I think this will play a positive role because, generally, you know that a number of republics have declared that they want to become nuclear-free. The removal of tactical nuclear weapons from those territories will be a step in that direction. Elements of trust inside the country will grow.

As far as the economic aspect of matters is concerned, it is a contradictory subject. The destruction of nuclear weapons requires money. We already know this from our experience with medium- and short-range weapons. This will lead to savings later, but initially it costs a lot of money. There is a certain contradiction here. Nevertheless, taking things as a whole, this reduction in the level of the military threat, of the nuclear threat, of nuclear weapons, is of course a factor which will promote stability both in the world and in every country, particularly nuclear countries.

[Levin] My thanks to Professor Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, adviser to the USSR president, for taking part in our program.

Disarmament Expert Evaluates U.S. Initiatives

AU0310123591 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 1 Oct 91 pp 1,2

[Interview with Aleksey Arbatov, leader of the Disarmament Section at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, leader of the Strategic Research Center at the International Organizations Administration set up by Shevarnadze, and adviser at the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by Demeter Pogar; place and date not given: "Arbatov: Military Reality to Politics"]

[Text] The USSR will reply to George Bush's disarmament proposals within the week, and Mikhail Gorbachev is working on a counterproposal, the INTERFAX independent news agency reported on 30 September, referring to one of the Soviet presidential spokesmen. How was the U.S. step received in Moscow, and what kind of answer is Moscow going to give? Aleksey Arbatov expounded his views to our newspaper.

[Pogar] Can we consider the cancellation of the military alert on U.S. strategic missiles as the final end of the cold war?

[Arbatov] In my opinion, the cold war ended a long time ago. President Bush's announcement adjusted the military reality to the political reality. However, the U.S. steps and announcements only affect a certain area of weapons systems. This in itself is not enough, because disarmament has to be extended to the other components of nuclear arsenals.

[Pogar] Can this U.S. proposal contribute to a return to the original concept of the START agreement, namely a 50 percent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons on both sides?

[Arbatov] There is no direct link between President Bush's proposals and the stipulations of the START agreement. In any case, the U.S. proposal to eliminate land-based missiles with multiple warheads would mean a more than 50-percent reduction for the USSR because it would only leave 40 percent of the Soviet nuclear arsenal. At the same time, the Americans would only have to part with 20 percent of their nuclear weapons. I also note that, talking about the European strategic nuclear weapons, Bush announced that for the time being they would be withdrawn from the continent and he did not say that they would be dismantled. In addition, a similar category of equipment, namely the air borne missiles will not be part of the reductions. Therefore, if the Americans withdraw their tactical weapons then they will reduce the number of their nuclear weapons by approximately 50 percent in Europe.

[Pogar] Republics that have recently expressed a desire to have nuclear weapons or at least to have a say in nuclear strategy must undoubtedly worry Washington. Can the U.S. announcement have any kind of effect on Kazakhstan or the Ukraine?

[Arbatov] Naturally. The Americans suggested the reduction of land-based missiles with multiple warheads, and the bases of these missiles are in Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, and Russia. If we reduce their numbers, we will first do it in Kazakhstan and the Ukraine, and Russia will only follow after that. As for the strategic weapons, we will probably agree to their dismantling. We will start to do this in places where there is a greater possibility that people who are not authorized to use them might get hold of them.

[Pogar] According to the news, Moscow might soon come up with some counter-proposals. What could they be?

[Arbatov] As I already mentioned, it is quite possible that we will agree to the disarmament of strategic nuclear weapons. We are also ready to speed up the reduction in the area of strategic weapons. It is also possible that a proposal will be made for a moratorium on nuclear tests, especially since the USSR has nowhere to execute these tests just now. In addition, there is a hope that the two sides will be able to cooperate in the civilian use and, possibly, the storage of the fissionable material of warheads that are to be dismantled or which have not yet been built.

[Pogar] The reactions of Soviet leaders differed somewhat from each other. For example, Gorbachev made much more restrained statements than Yeltsin. Why?

[Arbatov] Gorbachev might have been more cautious because he pays more attention to the soldiers, and he probably had not received their expert opinion before he gave his reaction. The emphases of his opinion are also shaped by the fact that the conservative forces accuse him of having given too many concessions to the West.

U.S. Plan Renders Nuclear War 'Virtually Impossible'

LD0310111591 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—The implementation of U.S. President George Bush's last week's initiative to reduce U.S. tactical nuclear systems renders a nuclear conflict virtually impossible, Sergey Rogov, an arms control expert at the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, told TASS.

Actually, the U.S. President's proposal envisages reductions in the two countries' nuclear weapons by 80-85 per cent, Rogov said.

For the sake of comparison, the expert recalled that the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, signed by the Soviet Union and the United States two months ago, will reduce their potential by 10-15 per cent.

Touching upon the U.S. initiative's portion concerning the phasing out of MIRVed intercontinental ballistic missiles, Rogov said that the implementation of this point might rule out the danger of an accidental missile launch, rendering a disarming nuclear strike impossible. He favoured cooperation in creating a defence system safeguarding against an unsanctioned missile launch or an attack from a third side.

Rogov believes that the possibility of reducing land-based nuclear arsenal should be linked with a limitation on submarine-launched weapons, in which the United States has an advantage.

In the opinion of the Soviet expert, an immediate termination of nuclear tests by the United States is unlikely. However, Rogov added, this may become a reality in the near future in the event of the implementation of the U.S. President-suggested plan.

Arguments for Total Nuclear Test Ban Examined

PM0310094991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 27 Sep 91 pp 1, 2

[Article by A. Mokerov and A. Sanin, associates of the USSR Academy of Sciences Program Research Center, under the "Competent Opinion" rubric: "Can Nuclear Testing Be Abandoned?"]

[Text] Now that Russia is faced with the real possibility of becoming the only nuclear republic among the states of the renewed Union, we believe that the time is ripe to return once more to this question: Is a complete ban on nuclear testing a dream or a reality?

Let us remind you that the United States and the USSR have officially acknowledged the impossibility of winning a nuclear war. The Soviet-U.S. statement adopted in Geneva in November 1985 states: "Nuclear war must never be unleashed" and "It can have no winners." So why, then, continue improving these terrible weapons?

More than 50,000 nuclear warheads have been stockpiled in the world, of which approximately 30,000 are in the nuclear arsenals of the USSR and approximately 20,000 in the United States. We have already become nuclear hostages of each other. Our mutual nuclear balance is stable, and no further improvement of nuclear weapons is capable of shaking it. A further buildup of the lethal arsenals has lost all military-strategic meaning. Therefore the introduction of even quite lengthy unilateral moratoriums on nuclear testing today involves no risk for either the USSR or the United States.

In our view the arguments cited in favor of continuing nuclear testing are insufficiently convincing. Chief among them are the following:

First argument: "The need to modernize the existing complexes of weapons which carry nuclear warheads."

To date the USSR has carried out 715 nuclear explosions. This number includes explosions carried out at the Semipalatinsk test site and in Novaya Zemlya, the peaceful nuclear explosions carried out in various parts of the USSR, and also the nuclear explosion carried out in Orenburg Oblast's Totskiy Rayon during troop exercises 17 October 1954. The United States has carried out 1,080 nuclear explosions. The United States is in the lead here. But if you take the total yield of charges tested through 1963, when the Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in the Three Environments was signed, then the USSR has considerably outstripped its rival, having exploded charges with a total yield of approximately 450 megatons, against 141 megatons in the United States. Over

the past 20 years the USSR has carried out 51 more explosions (366 against 315).

By carrying out such a number of nuclear tests the two sides evidently ensured the creation of a quite wide range of types of nuclear charges—which enabled them to achieve parity. This nuclear ammunition, based on experience of the existing first- and second-generation nuclear weapons, will evidently be able to continue to arm new and modernized nuclear weapon complexes for approximately 15-20 years. Thus, for the modernization and development of new weapon complexes, it is not necessary to conduct nuclear tests at least until the year 2000.

Second argument: "Nuclear tests are needed for the purpose of enhancing the safety, reliability, and efficiency of nuclear warheads and checking the existing nuclear warheads in the arsenal."

However, the reliability of nuclear warheads can be maintained at the prescribed level without carrying out real tests, just by testing mock-ups of nuclear warheads containing conventional explosives. In confirmation of the aforesaid it is possible to cite the authoritative opinion of Academician A. Sakharov, one of the creators of thermonuclear weapons in our country: "We can check all the circumstances connected with the storage of nuclear weapons without carrying out a real explosion, by making all the systems function with the exception of the final factor—the nuclear explosion. If the nuclear fuel is replaced by a passive substance, the final stage does not need to be checked."

Third argument: "Enhancement of the protection of nuclear warheads and models of military hardware against the damage producing elements of a nuclear explosion."

An alternative to nuclear tests in the interests of creating models of arms with enhanced protection against the damage producing elements of a nuclear explosion can be provided by a calculated theoretical assessment of their durability and protection with subsequent experimental confirmation of the levels of this protection on existing accelerators, reactors, and other experimental installations simulating the damage producing elements of a nuclear explosion.

Fourth argument: "The need for nuclear testing in order to develop third generation nuclear weapons."

Third generation nuclear weapons (or directed energy nuclear weapons) are weapons in which a considerable part of the energy of the explosion is transformed into a form different from the shock wave and thermal radiation and is concentrated in a set direction. Probably, the development of such weapons can serve as the only grounds in favor of continuing nuclear testing. Therefore it is possible to maintain that its cessation is linked primarily with the cessation of development of third generation nuclear weapons. And this is why it is so important to prevent the development of third generation nuclear weapons from escalating from the scientific research stage into the stage of real, full-scale tests.

Whether or not third generation nuclear weapons should exist is a question requiring a political solution! This means that, given the good will, there are virtually no obstacles to the conclusion of a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear testing. And, if it cannot be reached in the very near future, it is possible to introduce a ban in stages, by using appropriate restrictions and limits on the number of tests, the yields of the charges being tested, and also the test sites.

Also worthy of note is the question of so-called peaceful nuclear explosions, which can be used to construct canals, to expose mineral deposits, to create underground reservoirs for the storage of petroleum products and toxic waste, to intensify the exploitation of oil and gas, etc. The quest for such ways to employ the "peaceful atom" was long since stopped in the United States. Such explosions are not practiced in other countries.

There have been 115 peaceful nuclear explosions conducted in various parts of the Soviet Union. These include something of the order of 12 explosions on the territory of Yakutia, starting in the seventies, and 16 in the region of Azgir (Astrakhan Oblast) from 1968 through 1979. There were 25 underground explosions near Astrakhan during the period 1980-1984.

The last peaceful nuclear explosion in the USSR was carried out in Tyumen Oblast in the summer of 1989.

Some of them had quite a large yield, like, for example, explosion "1004," carried out near the Shagan River (East Kazakhstan) 15 January 1965. The yield of that explosion totaled more than 100 kilotons.

The project to divert northern rivers into the Volga has still not been forgotten. Within the framework of this project it was planned to construct the Pechora-Kolva Canal, with the proposal that 65 km of its length be created with the help of 250 nuclear explosions—which, in the opinion of experts, made it possible to reduce construction costs by a factor of between three and 3.5. Fortunately, that project did not come off—which, in our view, has averted a major ecological disaster. We believe that we are not exaggerating the danger. The 250 peaceful nuclear explosions (with a total yield of 750 megatons) would have discharged a vast quantity of radioactive soil and dust into the atmosphere and could have created a situation with extraordinarily serious ecological consequences (radioactive contamination) throughout the region.

The question of "turning Siberian rivers around" for the purpose of saving the Aral has recently begun to be debated once again. Without discussing the expediency of these projects, we would like to warn their new supporters against attempts to once again reduce the cost of possible work, if it ever begins, by using peaceful nuclear explosions.

It must be said most definitely that underground explosions—both those involving ejection of soil and those that are quite deep—are far from safe ecologically. A high level of radioactivity persists for as much as 100 years and more in the underground cavity of a nuclear explosion. Despite the fact that most of the radioactive products remain in a glass-like mass of hardened rock in the cavity of an explosion, a considerable quantity of them can get into the atmosphere. Nor can it be ruled out that the radionuclides of an underground explosion will be dissolved in and carried away by subsoil waters. At the same time the migration of radioactive isotopes results in their penetration of the plant and animal worlds and, through food chains, they might end up in the human organism.

Also rather debatable are the arguments of the supporters of continued nuclear testing in our country, claiming that its prohibition will result in "the degradation of unique collectives of highly-qualified professionals" engaged on nuclear weapons. If we were to follow this logic, the efforts that are being made to reduce and limit not only nuclear but also all kinds of arms, on which many collectives of specialists are working in our country, are completely pointless. Our task is precisely to ensure that these specialists and the corresponding organizations of the defense complex find their place within the framework of the current conversion and the realization of our "reasonable sufficiency" military doctrine.

So, there are no serious technical obstacles that could prevent the establishment of a regime of complete silence on nuclear test sites in the USSR and the United States. And, mindful of the favorable trends taking shape in relations between the USSR, Russia—the chief holder of the country's nuclear potential, and the United States, there is a chance of securing a complete nuclear test ban already by 1995. And it is necessary to step up joint efforts to ensure that this chance becomes a reality!

Worldwide Issues

CSCE Conference Approves Final Document

LD0310231791 Moscow TASS in English 2232 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS special correspondents Nikolay Vukolov, Andrey Krasnoshchekov, and Vitaliy Menshikov]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—The human dimension process has entered a new stage—it is the main result of the CSCE Conference on Human Dimension that has worked for four weeks in Moscow. This is illustrated by the final document, approved by consensus today by delegations of all the 38 countries-participants in the forum.

The document, which includes several sections, states coordinated stands of all participant-countries, which reflect new agreements to give a boost to the development of the common European process's human dimension, and new efforts to consolidate the institutes of democracy and protection of basic human rights and freedoms.

The principle formulated in the document's preamble can be viewed as a conceptual achievement of the Moscow meeting: Human rights are not an internal affair of some state, but the subject of common concern of participant-countries and their collective responsibility.

The document envisages additional guarantees of the observance of human rights under the state of emergency. While discussing this issue, representatives of participant-states expressed their concern over the destiny of democracy, and a threat posed to it by a coup attempt, an illustration to which was the recent events in the Soviet Union.

The conference has elaborated norms of the introduction of the state of emergency and the observance of human rights under the state of emergency.

Conference participants confirmed, in particular, that such state is justified only in extreme situations with due account, which is quite important, of international obligations of the country and its obligations within the CSCE framework.

The meeting stated the non-interference in activities of legislative bodies and legal guarantees of personal freedom, as well as took additional obligations on the provision of freedom of speech and information under these conditions.

Against the background of already existing international norms in this sphere, this step is especially significant in the light of plotters' actions in the USSR, when an arbitrary ban on the right to information was introduced and the plotters imposed their interpretation of events on the radio, television and other mass media.

Another item of the document is also significant: It says that independent mass media is a major condition for a free and open society and state systems, responsible for their actions, and that it plays a special role in guaranteeing human rights and freedoms.

The document also contains obligations on the protection of correspondents' rights. The need to adopt measures on the protection of correspondents in their dangerous trips, primarily, to spots of armed conflicts, was especially stressed.

Additional obligations were also taken to provide the rights of the detained and imprisoned, as well as to improve conditions of their custody.

For the first time the document draws attention to problems of invalids and makes an accent on the protection of women's rights.

A considerable attention was given to the protection of rights and freedoms of immigrant workers and members of their families.

The Moscow meeting showed that, despite a considerable progress in the observance of human rights and basic freedoms, one should never stop at what has been accomplished.

Recent events in some European countries require constant efforts of all members of the common European process to fulfill their CSCE obligations. Profound political changes on the continent should contribute to this fulfillment.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, U.S. Jewish Advocate View Emigration

PM0410084091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[By G. Alimov: "Dialogue on Problems of Soviet Jews"]

[Excerpts] Among the many meetings that USSR President M. Gorbachev has every day, his 2 October conversation with Shoshana Cardin attracted particular attention. There are several reasons for this, in particular the fact that it was the USSR president's first meeting with the head of the U.S. National Conference for the Affairs of Soviet Jews. [passage omitted]

We have learned that the topic of emigration was touched on during the conversation with S. Cardin. It was stated that the Soviet side proceeds on the basis of implementing in full a new policy on questions of emigration. But there is no intention to stimulate or encourage emigration. The official Soviet authorities also take the view that those who have already left for various reasons or are leaving now may return and visit as guests, that is, maintain natural ties with their homeland.

But problems are arising unexpectedly with the American side. There are cases of Soviet Jews coming up against American restrictions on emigration. Immigration is beginning to be blocked; processes of selection and grading are beginning. As a result the Soviet side naturally is becoming suspicious about U.S. immigration policy.

Our source states that during the conversation, M. Gorbachev came out in favor of establishing very broad ties with Israel, taking into account the fact that in that country nearly one in three inhabitants has roots in the USSR. They say that the USSR president, assessing the further development of relations with Israel, used the word "U-turn."

At S. Cardin's request, Gorbachev promised to take a fresh look at the problem of "refuseniks." It is a question of the treatment of people whose exit date is postponed on the grounds of their being acquainted with state secrets. Gorbachev reportedly stated: This problem must be examined from the standpoints of the present day: What kind of secrets remain current for more than five years? (A five-year limit set for emigration to other countries is reckoned to be the international standard.)

M. Gorbachev also said that the situation must not be idealized. We do have manifestations of antisemitism. But in his opinion they are not on a large scale.

Gates Testimony to Senate Panel Reported

PM0310120191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 91 Union Edition p 5

[By correspondent A. Blinov: "Television and Intelligence. CIA Cannot Keep Up with Journalists"]

[Text] Washington—"Quite honestly, we have not paid sufficient attention to the emergence of CNN and other 24-hour news relay systems on the scene, and consequently our intelligence data have to a considerable extent become obsolete before they reach the politicians' desks"—Robert Gates, the U.S. President's deputy assistant for national security affairs, made this unusually frank confession to the U.S. Congress.

R. Gates was speaking at hearings in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in connection with the approval of his candidacy for the post of director of central intelligence, leader of the CIA and the entire ramified U.S. intelligence community. Throughout his 25-year career as a government official, 47-year-old R. Gates has worked at the CIA or been associated with it as a senior official of the National Security Council.

This is not the first time the veteran of U.S. intelligence has complained that the television screen pushes intelligence dispatches into the background in the offices of U.S. politicians. Two years ago, at the time of the fleeting U.S. armed action in Panama, duty officers in the White House situations room discovered that reports from the streets of Panama by the CNN were appreciably ahead of cipher communications coming in from the leaders of the operation.

CNN, which belongs to the billionaire Ted Turner, specializes in round-the-clock news coverage. CNN correspondents broadcast from all the most important capitals in the world and, all the more so, from the planet's hot spots, to where they are promptly transferred with all the necessary communications equipment, even including portable "dish" antennas for satellite broadcasts.

During the war in the Persian Gulf, CNN television correspondents and cameramen scaled new heights of professionalism. CNN commentator Bernard Shaw transmitted the first episodes of the air raid on Baghdad, the start of the war, while Peter Arnett, the company's correspondent who stayed in Iraq practically until the end of the war, transmitted a television interview with

Saddam Husayn and reports from the ruins of a bombed-out bomb shelter in the Iraqi capital.

At the hearings in the Committee for Intelligence, however, the senators spoke more about other problems of the intelligence community. It was pointed out that the CIA, which was given birth to by the "cold war," has tried in every way to preserve its initial postulates. According to Senator Bill Bradley, the CIA put out overstated assessments of the Soviet Union's military might—the result, so he believes, of a deliberate juggling with intelligence data. Bill Bradley reported that U.S. intelligence submitted a report on the USSR's efforts in the sphere of creating a "space defense," which served to substantiate appropriations for the U.S. "Star Wars" program. The forecasts cited in the report, however, were not borne out. The CIA also underestimated perestroyka, trying for a long time to maintain that the more changes there are, the more everything stays the same. Iraq's seizure of Kuwait came as a surprise to U.S. intelligence.

It was pointed out at the hearings that the imperatives of the "cold war" frequently prompted the U.S. intelligence community to act "on the verge of a foul" regarding observance of the restrictions and rules laid down for in the laws of its own country. The shadow of one such action, "Irangate," hung over the procedure for approving the candidacy of Gates himself.

Senator H. Metzenbaum described as a "miraculous metamorphosis" of the intelligence veteran the assurances given in R. Gates' testimony that he will continue to pay special attention to control over the CIA's compliance with legality and to reckon with the oversight role of Congress. There followed equally solemn promises that the intelligence community will draw a conclusion from the ending of the "cold war" and restructure its work accordingly.

The reorganization of the CIA is inevitable. "The CIA and U.S. intelligence will have to be restructured and demonstrate changes," R. Gates admitted. "Otherwise they will come up against a feeling of superfluousness and growing sentiments in favor of their dissolution." One element of such a restructuring will be an attempt by the CIA to compete more effectively with CNN in the coverage of topical events—of course, for a narrow circle of recipients of its information.

In particular, it is proposed to equip "decision-making persons" with special video monitors on whose screens they would be able to see "continuously updated information on the situation throughout the world, backed up by graphic materials in the form of charts, photographs, etc." In addition, the scheme of familiarization with intelligence data, which has been "preserved from the 19th century," will be simplified.

At the same time, R. Gates, contrary to the predictions of futurologists about the triumph of technology over man, has proved to be an adherent of the "old system" of obtaining secrets with the help, as he put it, of "human intelligence"—in other words, secret agents. Moreover, this form of activity, he asseverated, will be strengthened in the future. Only thus is it possible to learn what cannot be observed by reconnaissance satellites, radio monitoring services, and other technical contrivances. And precisely this will evidently help intelligence to surmount the problem of competition with increasingly ubiquitous television.

"It could happen that the reorganization of the CIA will be headed by someone who is a relic of the 'cold war,'" Thomas Polgar, a CIA veteran who addressed the hearings as an expert, remarked in this connection.

East Europe

Pankin on Signing of CSFR Friendship Treaty

LD0410103491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1940 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy]

[Excerpts] Prague, 3 Oct (TASS)—Today Vaclav Havel, CSFR president, received Boris Pankin, USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is here for a working visit. [passage omitted]

In the course of further conversation, B. Pankin spoke about the main areas of Soviet foreign policy at the current stage, stressing such issues as nuclear disarmament and preparation for a peace conference on the Middle East. [passage omitted]

The practical aspects of bilateral Soviet-Czechoslovak relations were discussed in a broad sense. Mutual support was expressed for the idea of cooperation between the USSR and Europe as advantageous in both economic and political aspects for each participant in this potential interaction.

The conversation was distinguished by warmth and sincere friendly interest.

The USSR-CSFR treaty on good-neighborliness, friendly relations, and cooperation was initialed the same day. "The interstate treaty," B. Pankin said, "is a solid treaty base for forming the foundations of trust and genuinely good-neighborly relations, which opens up new prospects for their development within the framework of a peaceful European system.

"At the same time, a political line has been drawn for all time through the totalitarian past, including the use of force against Czechoslovakia in August 1968. That act, which was an interference in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs and incompatible with the norms of relations between sovereign states, had long-term negative consequences for the development of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union and influenced the international situation in an unfavorable way.

"We are stating that Soviet-Czechoslovak relations will be based on full respect for each other's sovereignty, equality of rights and good-neighborliness, and the priority nature of values common to all mankind." [passage omitted]

B. Pankin today had a conversation with D. Buresova, chairman of the Czech National Council, and P. Pithart, chairman of the government of the Czech Republic. The conversation dealt with the role of the republics in the development of relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. [passage omitted]

Views 'Radical' Changes in Relations

LD0410105891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2128 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy]

[Text] Prague, 3 Oct (TASS)—The treaty on good-neighborliness, friendly relations, and cooperation, initialled today, reflects radical changes for the better in the interaction between our countries, USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin declared at a news conference here today. I am sure that the day is not far off when the presidents of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union will meet and sign this treaty, the minister said. He noted that the signing of a further series of documents had taken place, especially an agreement on visa-free trips for Soviet and Czechoslovak citizens, as well as a plan for cooperation in the cultural, scientific, and educational fields.

I would like to thank the CSFR leadership for the invitation and opportunity to visit Czechoslovakia, B. Pankin stressed. "The visit is a very busy one. I had a cordial conversation with President Vaclav Havel and had talks on many serious questions of bilateral and international cooperation with the CSFR foreign minister. On a purely personal level, I have found it a source of joy and pleasure to be in Prague these days," said the head of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

Answering a question about the opening up of access to the archives of the KGB and the CPSU Central Committee, B. Pankin said that a considerable portion of the archives was sealed up. "But we have agreed with the Czechoslovak side that the archives of the USSR Foreign Ministry and all documents relating to the events of 1968 will be open," the minister observed.

B. Pankin pointed out that he has no doubts about the adequacy of the USSR's response to G. Bush's proposals. "We welcome these initiatives totally," the head of the Soviet foreign policy department declared, "and regard them as a major, historic step, a reaction to events in the Soviet Union and the irreversibility of the democratic processes that are enhancing the degree of trust between the USSR and the United States, and are making it possible to move along the road of a radical reduction in nuclear weapons."

B. Pankin talked about the series of intensive talks during the session of the UN General Assembly. He observed that the world was becoming more rational and wiser. There is an inclination, considerably more noticeable than previously, toward resolving all, even the most serious, problems through negotiation and the achievement of compromise. "One cannot attain security for oneself without thinking of one's partners," said the minister. "The defeat of the putsch gave a powerful impetus to the USSR's new steps in the international arena. I really do think that the world is changing for the better. And whether the process is just an episode depends largely on you and us."

In reply to one of the questions, B. Pankin spoke in favor of granting dual citizenship to Soviet emigres leaving the USSR for various reasons. "We will heal very many wounds thereby," the minister emphasized.

Slovakia Demands 'Passed Over' in CSFR Treaty

LD0310201191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Aleksandr Samylin]

[Text] As I transmit this material, the Czechoslovak capital is preparing for a festive occasion, at which a treaty between our country and Czechoslovakia will be initialed. That is the main aim of Boris Pankin's visit. He has promised that during the signing of the document he will speak about the events of 1968, too. All CSFR media have been specially assigned to this event today.

On the eve of the visit, the Slovak leadership demanded that its foreign minister should see that the new agreement contain a clause that will allow Slovakia to forge direct diplomatic, economic, and cultural links with republics in our country. Official Prague passed over this proposal in silence, and I have no information about its inclusion in the text of the interstate agreement. There will be another meeting, though, on Friday, when Boris Pankin arrives in Bratislava.

Foreign Ministry Reaffirms Position on Yugoslavia

LD0310190691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1730 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, Oct. 3 (TANJUG)—Soviet Foreign Ministry representatives told TANJUG's Moscow correspondent today that the Soviet Union has not changed its stand on the Yugoslav crisis.

The Soviet Union is still of the view that Yugoslavs themselves must find a solution, and in such a way as to preserve "a joint economic and legislative domain." The Soviet Union also believes it is necessary to preserve through democratic and peaceful negotiations all links among the Yugoslav republics which have been historically justified.

The reason for the talk with the Soviet Foreign Ministry officials was that certain independent Soviet agencies

have conveyed different messages on the Yugoslav crisis. Some journalists even cited officials as describing the events in Yugoslavia, as "a second Iraq." There was even mention of a consensus on the recognition of the Yugoslav Republic of Slovenia, including the possibility of the Soviet Union doing so eventually.

The official Soviet spokesman told TANJUG that all that has been published on Yugoslavia did not come from the Third Department which is solely responsible and qualified to give the official Soviet stand. Foreign Ministry officials added that the Soviet Union was deeply concerned about the bloodshed in Yugoslavia, and urged that it stop as soon as possible. The Soviet Union assessed that it was good that the European Community (E.C.) countries, or rather, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) shared this concern and are undertaking efforts aimed at setting up dialogue between the warring sides.

Miners' Use of Force in Romania Deplored

92UF0013B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Sep 91 Single Edition p 4

[Commentary on TASS report "Head of the Romanian Government Has Resigned: Miners on the Streets of Bucharest" by Yevgeniy Spekhov: "Our Comments"]

[Text] One more confrontation between miners and the government is taking place in Romania. It is one of the most severe crises of recent times. The miners insist that they have lost their patience, that their life has become unbearable. Even though their demands were speedily satisfied, they continued to urge the government to resign, and they got what they wanted: Prime Minister P. Roman has resigned, and a new government will be formed on the principles of national accord. His resignation was accepted by the Romanian president. The miners, nevertheless, announced a general strike of unlimited duration.

Things happen just the opposite way, as they say. During their last march to Bucharest, the miners seemed to be defending the authorities from "rioters," which was their name for the students and the young people of the city. But they were not very particular about their methods then either. They were hitting people left and right. This time the power itself became the target of their attacks. Again there are tanks and APCs in the streets of Bucharest and, what is most tragic, people get killed and wounded.

Violence does not resolve arguments, it can lead to nothing good. The process of democratization in Romania is being endangered. During many decades of it, the country did not have its fill of dictatorship. There will be a high price to pay for the retreat from law and order. Whatever the country managed to acquire with such difficulty in two years can be lost very easily. Western businessmen will also think many times before they decide to invest their money in Romanian economy.

But recent events also contain a certain lesson for politicians: It is easier to prevent a fire than to extinguish it, especially when the flames make no distinction between the right and the wrong side. Unfortunately, politicians, and not only Romanian ones, are starting to understand this with great tardiness.

IZVESTIYA Views Future of Ethnic Poles

PM0410092191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5

[Article by N. Yermolovich: "Soviet Poles' March on Warsaw Will Not Take Place"]

[Excerpts] Will Soviet Poles go to Poland? Just a month or two ago this question was entirely reasonable. But Lithuania has declared its independence, and, after all, Poles are one of the largest national minorities there. Of course they can no longer be called "Soviet."

Nonetheless, the problem remains. What is its thrust? Outside Poland there are at least (it is impossible to cite an exact figure) 13 million people of Polish origin. That means that almost one Pole in every four lives abroad. Most of them live in the United States. The Soviet Union comes second. [passage omitted]

Before the war there could be no question of returning to Poland. Convoys of Poles moved only in one direction: eastward, deep inside the country. First they were the "kulaks" and "kulak followers," and then, as of September 1939, they were "socially alien elements" from the liberated oblasts of the West Ukraine and Belorussia and interned officers and soldiers of the Polish Army. Of course, moving with them in the same direction in immeasurably larger numbers were convoys of Soviet citizens of other nationalities who were also repressed.

At the height of World War II only one large group of Poles, Anders' army together with the families of servicemen, moved in the opposite direction: westward.

The postwar years opened a new page in Soviet-Polish relations. They were marked, apart from anything else, by two waves of repatriation. The point is that the new Soviet-Polish border was far further west than the old one. In addition, Lithuania, with a substantial Polish population, especially in the Vilnius region, became part of the USSR. Polish researchers believe that 2 million to 2.5 million Poles lived between the old and new Soviet-Polish borders in 1944-1945. "Spontaneous" repatriation was not taken into account. But by 1948 some 1,517,000 former Polish citizens had officially been repatriated from the USSR.

The second wave was in 1956-1957. It was then that 256,000 Poles left the Soviet Union.

Such are the facts relating to history, albeit recent history. But recently the Polish mass media increasingly have begun to publish reports that a "third wave of

repatriation" is imminent. These reports have excited the public, not just the Polish public, and generated various attitudes.

People in Vilnius reacted most keenly. V. Landsbergis stated at a Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session that information on some third wave of repatriation of Poles from the republic had been distributed by... the KGB resident in Poland. He described this report and the rumors that are being released as a deliberate act of provocation, whose aim is to step up tension in relations between Poles and Lithuanians and to set them against each other.

There is obviously a reason for this last point. At any rate this confirms the report that has been glimpsed in the foreign and Soviet mass media that the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has allegedly been issued an ultimatum by the "Vilnius region liberation army." The ultimatum says: "Unless relevant statements are made before 1 November this year about the right of the population of the Vilnius region to a free referendum, we patriots of the 'Vilnius region liberation army,' who unite in our ranks the sons and daughters of the great Slav leaders of Russia, Poland, and Belorussia, will begin hostilities against Lithuanian formations on the territory of the Polish national-territorial region."

Our own correspondent in Lithuania, N. Lashkevich, has assessed these rumors as greatly exaggerated, as being a propaganda weapon of the political groupings in Lithuania and Poland that would like to heat the situation in the Vilnius region as much as possible. In the opinion of C. Okinczyc, a deputy of the republic's Supreme Soviet and an active member of the Polish parliamentary faction, the same aim is served by the story of the possible departure of Poles from Lithuania. A more detailed analysis of events, the deputy said, makes it possible to assert that there will not be and should not be a third repatriation.

Jan Plater-Gajewski, chairman of the society for liaising with and assisting Poles in the USSR, has an extremely negative attitude toward the idea, propagandized recently by the Polish press, of the mass resettlement of Soviet citizens of Polish origin in the motherland of their ancestors. In an interview published in the newspaper GAZETA WYBORCZA, this public figure, who moved from Karaganda two years ago to take up permanent residence in Poland, stated that "there can be no question of repatriation for neither these people themselves nor their fathers or grandfathers have ever visited Poland." He said that Poles cannot be allowed to come to their ethnic motherland from Kazakhstan or Siberia and then curse themselves for doing so, when their compatriots use the offensive nickname "butchers" [term of abuse applied to Russians] to describe them. Unfortunately, J. Plater-Gajewski notes, this is entirely possible in Polish society. In this connection mass emigration is permissible only with the relevant preparation in Poland of socioeconomic conditions for the reception of Soviet Poles. J. Plater-Gajewski stressed that Soviet people's attitude toward their Polish fellow citizens is entirely positive.

"If the re-emigration of Poles from the West accords with the interests of our state," the newspaper KURIER POLSKI believes, "then the prospect of mass re-emigration from the Soviet Union generates serious doubts. In the opinion of the Foreign Ministry department for consular and refugee affairs, to agree to the mass exodus of Poles from the USSR given the state's present financial position is simply impossible. If one supposes that only 1 million Poles return to Poland over the course of five years, this will require 20-30 trillion zloty ($2-3 billion). The newspaper stresses that "the exodus of a considerable number of Poles, especially those now living on the territories that were part of Poland before World War II, would contradict Poland's interests."

The newspaper puts forward a plan that is somewhat reminiscent of the "Soviet Polish experiment" but, of course, without its socialist background. It proposes "elaborating a mechanism that would make it possible to guide the resettlement of people of Polish nationality living in Kazakhstan, Siberia, and other places far removed from their national roots and to settle them closer to the Polish border, for instance, in Kaliningrad Oblast." The newspaper proposes that only "meritorious" people, in particular former soldiers and officers of the Home Army and also those who are being reunited with their families and asking for political asylum, should be resettled to Poland from Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Lithuania.

The discussion of the likelihood of re-emigration drew the public's attention to the position of national minorities in the adjacent countries. That perhaps was the main positive outcome of the discussion. "The fundamental avenue of Polish policy regarding Poles living in the USSR," KURIER POLSKI concludes, "should be the desire to create conditions that would promote the development of national identity and national traditions and ensure their appropriate political and social status. This can be achieved by taking part in the creation of Polish centers, schools, and hospitals on USSR territory and by specific material aid to people and organizations."

The same idea was continued by Democratic Union deputy Jacek Kuron when he spoke in the Polish Sejm. He said: "The most effective path toward the improvement of the position of Poles in Lithuania, Belorussia, and the Ukraine lies through concern for Lithuanians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians in Poland."

West Europe

Gorbachev, Kohl Cheer German Unity, 'New Era'

LD0310232491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2013 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Telephone conversation between President Mikhail Gorbachev and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl on 3 October—recorded]

[Text] [Kohl] Hello, Mikhail. How are you? I am also very glad to hear your voice. I wanted to call you today—and that's how it's worked out—to simply look back together with you once again at the events of one year ago and to recall the day on which we achieved German unity. There is a German saying: Gratitude is the language of the heart. For me this gratitude also requires that we recall that with your support and the support of all your staff and your entire people we achieved German unity, and we are now able to embark on the construction of a peaceful and free future. After all the difficult events of the past, this is a great and wonderful thing.

[Gorbachev] Helmut, I agree with everything you have said, and I am really very glad that we are able to conduct this conversation on the eve of the first anniversary of this great event. First and foremost, I naturally want to express good wishes to the federal chancellor, all your colleagues, and all Germans on this first anniversary. The events of the past 12 months indeed enable us to say that a genuine breakthrough and a very large step was taken in the history of the German state, our relations, and European and world history. I want to say that the unity of the German nation has not only benefited Germany itself but also Europe, and it has also lifted our relations to a completely different level. We have entered a new era, as it were.

[Kohl] Yes, and it's a fine thing. I remember, thinking back to the past two years, starting with the night when we stood on the shores of the Rhine, that fundamental and profound changes have indeed occurred throughout the world between then and now. It is almost like a dream, but a dream come true.

[Gorbachev] I absolutely agree with these words of yours, because the last year was really a special year, a year of stormy events. The things that we had in mind and that we hoped for are now becoming a reality.

[Kohl] I hope that in your country, too, everything is on the right track. Above all, I hope you will soon be able to conclude the agreement among the republics, because that will be a precondition for further positive development.

[Gorbachev] Yes, I can tell you that in Alma-Ata yesterday, 12 republics—and a 13th one, Latvia, as an observer—initialed an economic agreement at the level of republican heads of government. Also yesterday, I sent the leaders of the republics new proposals that we drafted with Yeltsin. It was by agreement with the other republics. They concern a new treaty on a union of sovereign states. So, through difficulties and difficult endeavors, the road toward a new Union and new cooperation in the framework of the Union can already be discerned, and I think this is not only in the interests of the peoples that live here in our country, on this enormous territory, but also in the interests of Europeans and the whole world, given that the Soviet Union is involved.

Nevertheless, Helmut, on this day I would like to express words of gratitude to you, the government, and all Germans, who at this difficult time for us are displaying solidarity and deep understanding for our problems and a readiness for broad cooperation. We can all see it here, feel it, and appreciate it very much. It is evident that the good seeds of friendship and cooperation that the two of us sowed in the past have not only sprouted but also bearing their first fruit.

[Kohl] Yes, thank you very much. Please give my sincere regards to Boris Yeltsin from me and my wife. I wish you good luck and all the best, especially in the difficult and complex decisions that have to be made in the coming week [as heard]. We can telephone each other again soon, as this is now common practice for us.

[Gorbachev] Thank you, Helmut. Raisa Maximovna and myself would like to convey warm greetings to your colleagues, and to Hannelore. Like you, I also hope that we will be in touch soon. Let us cooperate as we said we would, and as we are doing. I very much appreciate this cooperation of ours. And, once more, I would like to congratulate you, the government, and the people on this great event. Goodbye.

[Kohl] Goodbye.

Gorbachev Answers Media Questions

LD0310221391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2020 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Report on telephone interview with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev by unidentified German reporters—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] After the conversation [with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl], USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev answered questions from German television journalists. In particular, he said on the subject of the U.S. initiative:

[Gorbachev] You know, in our press and in the world press, some sort of discussion and even alarm or agitation has manifested itself. But no, everything is progressing as it should. Anyone with any understanding of the matter appreciates the fact that in order for there to be adequate proposals in reply to the major initiative that has been put forward by the U.S. Administration, then a certain amount of time is necessary. The point in principle is clear. I evaluated this initiative highly. I placed it on the same level as Reykjavik and assured the President that they can count on our positive and appropriate reaction. I asked him several questions; they also proved to be far from simple for him to answer, and I am sure that they are thinking them over. But I have still not asked all my questions. The President and I agreed that it is necessary to begin contacts immediately to clear up all the questions that have arisen in our minds. The President said straightaway that he liked this idea, and now a presidential representative is coming to us. Everything is under way.

I passed a special presidential instruction. I have formed a group, and it is already at work. It is preparing, it is making, a detailed analysis of the U.S. side's proposals. I want to say once again that this is a very complex subject. It is preparing our own proposals. You know, I think that there are going to be proposals from our side that will signify a development of these. But just wait a little, wait a little.

[Unidentified reporter] Answer another question please. How has the political situation changed after the failed putsch in the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] I would say this about the situation: It is not simple. The defeat of the putsch has, to a significant degree, concluded the process of destroying those structures on which the putschists relied. On the whole, new opportunities have been created for all the reforms. So major new opportunities have opened up.

But it must be kept in mind that time has been lost in implementing measures in the economic sphere, especially regarding stabilization, and it is necessary to catch up. That is the first thing. Second, we now need to return again to the problems of the Union treaty and the solution of principal and cardinal problems, such as the conclusion and signing of a treaty on a union of sovereign states as well as an economic agreement, as a major part of all this. This is all of fundamental significance.

As long as these cardinal decisions remain unmade, they will have an effect on the course of all our lives, in both the political and economic spheres and in exchanges, and this all has an effect on people's lives. This is why at the moment I am practically working exclusively on an economic agreement and a new treaty on a union of sovereign states. I have already said how things look when talking with the chancellor; he was also interested. It is precisely within the framework of this process that a regrouping of political forces and a reallocation of powers is going on, and naturally, all the participants in this process is changing.

But this is as we intended. I consider it important that this process is proceeding within the framework of and in the channel of democratic transformations, in constitutional forms. I hope that this will yield its fruit in the nearest future, because we believe that we should sign an economic agreement in the first half of October, and that in October we should also embark on the signing of a Union treaty. Goodbye!

Gosteleradio 'Can Count On' Italian Aid

PM0310155191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[By correspondent M. Ilinskiy: "Gosteleradio Seeks Partners in Italy"]

[Text] Rome—"Television, Mass Media, and Organs of Power." That is the subject of countless conferences, "roundtables," symposiums, and meetings being held these days in various Italian cities.

The Italian television market is totally saturated. There are 753 channels operating in the country, including three state channels: RAI 1, RAI 2, and RAI 3. The rest are private firms. Some 1,040 companies have applied to engage in television and radio broadcasting in 1992, and roughly half of them will have their request met.

It is easy to imagine the kind of struggle under way on the "airwaves." Only those companies with the most modern technology, material base, financial support, highly qualified cadres, and extensive domestic and international communications will win the competitive battle. The state company RAI and the private concern Silvio Berlusconi are television giants of that kind in Italy. It is obviously equally easy to realize why Ye.V. Yakovlev, chairman of the Gosteleradio [All-Union Television and Radio Broadcasting Company], is now holding talks in Italy on business cooperation.

"The new radio and new Soviet television," RAI President Enrico Manca said at a news conference after the talks, "can count on aid from Italian state radio and television in the sphere of technology, in vocational training for cadres, in information technology, in access to the market, and in expanding their audience. These plans can be implemented through Italian Government funding, in particular via the law on relations with East European countries currently under discussion in Parliament."

At the press conference, E. Manca read out the text of a letter from Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis saying that the Italian Government will channel some of the funds earmarked for East European countries into implementing RAI's plans for Soviet television.

Latin America & Caribbean

Foreign Ministry Condemns Haitian Coup

LD0310123291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0803 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 3 Oct (TASS)—The report that the government of President Jean Bertrand Aristide, elected democratically at the end of last year, had been overthrown on Haiti following a coup d'etat carried out by a group of officers headed by the commander of the Armed Forces was received with deep concern in the Soviet Union. This is said in a USSR Foreign Ministry statement that has been circulated here.

What has taken place on Haiti clearly demonstrates the topical nature of international action against illegal, anti-human actions that undermine constitutional order wherever it may be, the document continues. The proposal to set up an operational mechanism to defend democracy and law and order in the member countries of the Organization of American States, which was put

forward at the 21st session of the organization's General Assembly, becomes especially topical in this connection.

We resolutely condemn the anti-constitutional actions in Haiti that have led to deaths and have violated the democratic process, which enjoys mass support from the Haiti people. We express the hope that the escalation of violence on Haiti will be stopped without delay and that constitutional order in that country will be restored in the very near future, the statement stresses.

Cuban Emigrants Comment on Castro Regime

92UF0028A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Sep 91 Union Edition p 5

[By special correspondent Yevg. Bay; continued from IZVESTIYA issues Nos. 229, 230—not translated by FBIS: "Another Cuba"]

[Excerpt]

3. Concerning the Monument, the Cow, and the Forgotten Combat Pilot

Miami, Moscow—In 1975, when I came to the island for the first time, portraits of F. Castro could be seen in almost every Cuban home. When the Cuban leader made his speeches, radios or television sets were turned on in the majority of households. It was an impressive sight. When you walked along the street, the doors of the houses would be cracked, and the voice of the revolutionary leader could be heard from everywhere.

Unity demonstrations in the Square of the Revolution in Havana were equally impressive. Up to one-half of the people of Havana, which has a population of 2 million, converged on the square in order to listen to Fidel. The people came here of their own accord. Nobody forced them to, even though they were lined up in columns by the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution. Fidel's speeches enthralled the crowds, driving them into a frenzy. It was apparent that these people would follow their idol anywhere. He was no Ceausescu, he was no Husak, and he was certainly no Babrak Karmal. Castro himself, arms in hand, had won his right to be the supreme commander and master of Cuba.

Fidelism became a religion that replaced Catholicism for many people. The attraction to the religious and mystical element in the Cuban leader, who had been reared by Jesuits, had always been strong (which, however, did not prevent him from crushing the local church). The ideological cocktail based on Marxism and anti-Americanism was also liberally spiked with Christian ideas of social justice. While still young, F. Castro understood that being a "leftist" dictator was safer than being an authoritarian ruler with right-wing leanings.

In 1987, however, when I left the island, many Cubans would turn their radios and televisions off when the leader began to speak. By then, the population was responding poorly to the social demagoguery in the environment of all-pervasive corruption in the party apparatus, the food shortage, their meager earnings, and the continuous police monitoring of citizens' lives. The endless appeal and incantations about "socialism or death," about "the need for the people to rally around the party in the face of the inevitable imperialist aggression," as well as the ever lengthening discourse by the Commander in Chief on the utility of riding bicycles or the significance of manure as an energy source, his appeals to combat "sedentarismo"—a sedentary way of life—and smoking, and the campaign for donating vital organs, could no longer attract their attention.

The Cubans' dislike for the authorities became especially strong after December 1986, when the government adopted a set of measures intended to ensure greater economy of resources. "The revolutionary measures" first affected all the low-income segments of the population. For example, the morning snack was eliminated in day care centers. The offices began to issue potatoes instead of rice, which is the main food staple for Cubans. Quotas for meals for retirees at discount prices were reduced. Free breakfasts in worker cafeterias were eliminated. It was absurd against the background of the incredible squandering of resources and materials shipped in from the Soviet Union and the countries of East Europe when priceless machine tools and equipment were left to gather rust out in the open for months (as usual, the best was shipped to "friends"), when ports were cluttered up with Soviet cars, and warehouses were jammed with tires, which were in short supply.

They turned off both the sound and the picture, and those who could left for Miami, abandoning the portraits on the walls. Others were overcome by social apathy, and they performed their revolutionary duties for safeguarding and maintaining vigilance solely because they were threatened with having their ration cards revoked. The historic experiment, to which the easy-going Cubans were even less well suited than we, was not working out. As years went by, it increasingly became a tragic farce. To be sure, Cuba is a small country, but I have no less pity for it than I have for a great power.

The tragedy of a single individual became the tragedy of an entire people. I understand the desire of the leaders of the Hispanic world, who gathered this year in Guadalajara, to do everything they could to avoid driving Castro into a corner, to give him an opportunity to retreat while saving face, and to accomplish a certain democratic maneuver. We and the East Europeans have a greater aversion to the deeds and declarations of the aging caudillo: We have quite recently experienced the full extent of totalitarianism.

Castro still remains a firm and courageous anti-American leader for a Latin America living through the inception of its democracy. To us, he remains a hero out of our own sad past, but the kind of hero who is a millstone around our necks. As one American scholar put it, "Castro was a problem for the United States when

he was an ardent revolutionary; after he became a decrepit dogmatist, he became a problem for the Soviet Union."

This is the tragedy of a bright and definitely unconventional individual. Many of Castro's former comrades in arms, who broke with his regime, believe that it could not have been otherwise. They are convinced that the blame devolves not only on the erroneous nature of the Marxist doctrine but also on the faults of the leader himself with his Napoleonic bent, who, as soon as he came to power, began to deal harshly with anyone who was even a potential threat to his dominance.

This is also what Brigadier General Rafael del Pino, formerly a prominent Cuban military commander, told me. He began to fight in the ranks of the insurgent army as early as 1956. After the victory of the revolution, he became one of the founders of the air force. After the battle of Playa Jiron, Castro called him "a national hero." During the war in Angola, Rafael del Pino commanded the air force of the Cuban expeditionary corps. In recent years, he was deputy commander of the republic Air Defense and the Air Force of the republic.

In 1987 General Pino fled Cuba with his entire family in a single-engine Cessna, which he piloted himself. That was on 28 May, the same day that a similar Cessna carrying Matthias Rust landed in Red Square. The latter took less of a risk: He was not pursued by ultrasonic MiG's with orders to destroy the target.

I interviewed General Rafael del Pino for the first time in Havana in 1983. I talked to him again in Miami in 1991. At that time he handed me a book he had written after he was already in the United States. It happened to include the interview published in IZVESTIYA back then.

The book includes a curious episode. General del Pino writes that his illusions about the correctness of the chosen path were dispelled long ago. He saw clearly that the authorities had become rotten to the core—("The people judged how influential a general or a minister was by the number of houses he bought for his mistresses rather than the number of stars on his epaulettes")—that the highest leaders of the country had become involved in contraband narcotics—("I cannot imagine that they could conceal from Castro, who knew how many pounds of candy his soldiers were issued in Angola, the number of flights carrying cocaine through Cuba or the dollar amounts generated by its sale")—and the duplicity of the Cuban leaders in communication with their Soviet "brethren"—("it was Castro's doing that the word 'bolo,' as applied to Soviets, gained currency in Cuba. A 'bolo' is a piece of rough wood, which connotes something obtuse, inflexible, and uncultured. Actually, Castro despised all of you; he merely used you as a shield in his struggle against the Americans, for whom he had fostered a blind hatred since as early as 1958.")

It was the decision of the Cuban Government, however, to build a monument...to a record-holding Cuban cow nicknamed Ubre Blanca, "the White Udder," in whose appearance, according to the official press, the commander in chief was personally involved, that was the last straw for the combat pilot. By the mid-1980's this cow had become the world champion after producing about 110 liters of milk in three milkings on the same day. But to build a monument to it?

At the time, Rafael del Pino announced publicly: "I have nothing at all against this animal. We may build a monument to the Mayaba donkey if we wish (there is such a donkey in the Cuban province of Olgin famous for drinking beer before the eyes of amazed foreign tourists). I am outraged by something else, by the fact that in 30 years we have been unable to put up even a modest monument to the pilots who died in combat at Playa Jiron. As if it were not bad enough that their bodies have not been recovered. At the very least, a small monument could have been erected at the air strip from which they took off."

In Miami, I had occasion to speak with many defectors, "traitors who ended up in the service of the CIA," as the Cuban newspapers called them. Here is what is interesting: I was able to speak with almost all of them in Russian. The last defector who crossed the Florida Straits several weeks earlier flying a Soviet MiG had also completed courses at one of our academies.

Jose Oro, a civilian nuclear engineer, explained this phenomenon in part. He was very excited when he saw Soviet journalists at the Spanish-language radio station Mambi in Miami. His speech suddenly became rapid and confused. Perhaps a stranger would not have understood what Jose was so happy about: "As early as 1985, when I saw for the first time that something in the Soviet Union was changing, I felt a great sense of relief. Yes, I told myself, the system should change. It is changing already. In Moscow, I saw progress everywhere. This does not have to do with McDonalds restaurants or foreign magazines on the newsstands. Your people no longer fear the system the way Cubans do. We have a great deal in common. There is a shortage of food and housing, and wages are abysmal. It is impossible, however, to breathe in Havana after seeing the present-day Moscow...A half year ago, the Soviet movie 'Repentance' was being shown in a Havana movie theater, perhaps by chance. It played for only one day. When the trial of General Ochoa, a Cuban hero accused of being involved in drug trafficking, began, my neighbor, who had also lived in the Union, said: 'This is a trial of the Cuban Churanov.' 'No,' I replied, 'it is the trial of our Tukhachevskiy.'"

I put the words "Another Cuba" in the headline, having in mind the sizeable colony of emigree Cubans. However, as I discussed it, I could not but touch on aspects of life on the island itself that are little known or not known at all. This is also "another Cuba" of sorts. [passage omitted]

Supreme Soviet

Gorbachev Decree Postpones Supreme Soviet Session

LD0310223291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1950 GMT 3 Oct 91

["Text of decree signed today by the USSR president deferring the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Oct (TASS)—In connection with the fact that the leaders of several republics have reported it is impossible to complete the formation of their deputations to the USSR Supreme Soviet before 8 October 1991, and guided by the USSR law of 5 September 1991 "on the bodies of state power and the Government of the USSR during the transitional period," I decree:

The first session of the new format Supreme Soviet of the USSR is to be postponed until 21 October 1991 in the city of Moscow.

Political & Social

Coup Investigators Holds News Conference

LD0310173491 Moscow TASS in English 1644 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Novikov and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—The first news conference by the parliamentary commission to investigate causes and circumstances of the state coup in the USSR was held in the Kremlin. The commission's chairman, USSR People's Deputy Alexandr Obolenskiy summed up the commission's work.

He expressed the hope that the first parliamentary commission in the country's history to investigate the causes and circumstances of the putsch will be the last one of this kind. Obolenskiy said that sensation-seekers are bound to be disappointed. The law regulating the commission's activity obliges it to work in camera and prevent any leakage of the information which constitutes state secrets or secrets of the preliminary investigation.

Obolenskiy said the commission will not stoop to painting what happened in black-and-white colours and to biased attitude to people. Its task is not that of punishing participants of the putsch, but of assessing their role in it. It should be taken into consideration that these people may have thought their actions to be beneficial for the country, in which lies their tragedy.

Committee Silent About Work

LD0310235991 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Novikov and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—Journalists have actually received no information at the first news conference given today by the parliamentary commission investigating the causes and circumstances of the abortive coup d'etat in the USSR. Reporters were told nothing either about the causes of the putsch or the circumstances under which it happened. Evasive replies followed when journalists tried to clarify anything about the work accomplished by the commission. There was an impression that openness was not mandatory in this case.

Certainly, journalists did not expect any sensational facts or secrets to be divulged to them. But one would agree that meeting with the press only to tell about the goals and tasks of the commission is too little for journalists and the public which is waiting with impatience, and understandably so, for clarifications to the circumstances for the sake of which the commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet was formed on August 31.

Invoking by Commission Chairman Aleksandr Obolenskiy the law that regulates the commission's activity, which directly orders it to maintain tight secrecy in conducting work and prevent any leakage of information that represents state secret or the secret of the preliminary investigation, also explains little.

Journalists were told that all members of the commission gave a respective written promise. The news conference forcefully demonstrated that the commitment was kept. It is a paradox that the public today knows more about the causes and circumstances of the coup from investigating bodies, for which the letter of the law is no less mandatory, than from the commission of the federal parliament.

At the same time, it was made clear to journalists that the commission was not indifferent to the fate of the putschists. It is not by chance that neither commission chairman Obolenskiy nor his deputies Vladimir Yudin and Yuriy Komarov gave a clear answer to the question of what feelings the plotters stirred in them: condemnation, sympathy or indignation. Conversely, it was emphasised that the "commission will not stoop to painting what happend in black-and-white colours and to a biased attitude to people. Its task is not that of punishing participants in the putsch, but of assessing their role in it. It should be taken into consideration that these people may have thought their actions to be beneficial for the country, in which lies their tragedy."

But journalists did manage to learn something. For instance, the principles of the commission's work and that it should submit its report to the federal parliament by December 1. Those present were told that several more people's deputies and experts joined the commission's work and seven subcommissions were set up within its framework.

Closed Trial for Putchists Probable

OW0310182991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1645 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Members of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission investigating the circumstances of the August coup held a news conference in Moscow on Thursday. The commission head Aleksandr Obolenskiy disappointed journalists by saying that the work would proceed behind closed doors and commission members would not give interviews since they had pledged to keep their findings secret. He complained that the difficult political situation complicated the work considerably. The trial of the putsch organizers might be closed too, Obolenskiy said, although he would like court hearings to be open.

Commission member Vladimir Yudin said he did not think the trial would begin before the end of the year.

Primakov on Relations With Baltic Secret Services

OW0210182691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1700 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Yevgeniy Primakov, the new head of the Soviet foreign intelligence service, told a news conference in Moscow October 2 that his service will work on the territory of the Baltics only if they pose a real threat to the USSR. He noted that "the recognition of the Baltics' independence was an absolutely justified process" but said these states should respect human rights, especially, of the Russian-speaking population.

Mr. Primakov expressed hope that the nascent secret services in the Baltics will cooperate with the Soviet intelligence service. As he put it, "they are welcome".

Ousted Foreign Intelligence Chief Interviewed

PM0310111191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 91 pp 2-3

[Interview with L.V. Shebarshin, former chief of the USSR KGB First Chief Directorate, by I. Kadulin under the rubric "From the Life of the Special Services"; date and place not specified: "Shebarshin Has Resigned. Whom Can We Trust Now?"]

[Text] Leonid Vladimirovich Shebarshin, former chief of the USSR KGB First Chief Directorate (foreign intelligence), was born in Marinaya roshcha in Moscow in 1935. In 1952 he entered the Institute of Oriental Studies. After the institute closed in 1954 Shebarshin was among the one-third of the students who transferred to the third-year course at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations. He studied there till 1958.

A year earlier Shebarshin had met his future wife Nina, a Sinologist, in the virgin lands.

In 1958 Shebarshin began working at the Foreign Ministry and was sent on his first foreign assignment to Pakistan, where he became acquainted with First Chief Directorate staffers, who suggested that he transfer to the Lubyanka.

In 1962 Shebarshin returned to Moscow and began working as an operative with the rank of junior lieutenant and was trained at the Yu.V. Andropov Institute—in the intelligence school.

He has worked abroad for a long time (we know what he was doing).

In 1983 he returned to Moscow and worked as deputy chief of the Information Directorate, where he prepared First Chief Directorate reports for the country's top leadership.

In 1989, rising rung by rung up the entire official ladder of the intelligence service, he became, at Kryuchkov's suggestion, a lieutenant general in the KGB, the 14th First Chief Directorate chief in KGB history, and deputy chairman of the committee.

On 18 September this year Shebarshin submitted to Vadim Bakatin, the new KGB chairman, a report in which he protested at the influence of favoritism in the appointment of an outsider as his first deputy. In the same report he tendered his resignation. A few days later, Bakatin granted his request.

Professional colleagues and intelligence specialists call Shebarshin the first real professional to head Soviet intelligence and the last professional in the KGB leadership.

He speaks English and Hindi fluently, drives a car, and is a good shot. His favorite writers are Lev Tolstoy and Kurt Vonnegut, his favorite composer is Handel, and his favorite artist is Vereshchagin. He has no favorite newspaper and his favorite magazine is NAUKA I ZHIZN. He does not like light music. He smokes "Yava" and is not averse to brandy. In food his tastes are simple. His favorite time of year is the golden fall in the Moscow region.

[Kadulin] Leonid Vladimirovich, how were you appointed to the post of First Chief Directorate chief?

[Shebarshin] There was nothing especially interesting about the appointment. On 24 January 1989 Kryuchkov introduced me to Gorbachev in the Kremlin. Gorbachev received us between 9 am and 10 am in the office where Politburo sessions are usually held and we talked for about 10-15 minutes.

[Kadulin] What did you talk about with Gorbachev?

[Shebarshin] The president expressed a few brief and businesslike ideas on our activity. He said roughly this: "While we are conducting the most serious disarmament talks with the West it is important not to overlook

anything, not to be left unarmed. It is a very responsible moment..." It was all decided in advance and no one asked for my consent.

[Kadulin] Clearly, after your appointment your freedom was considerably restricted; you had a bodyguard, did you not?

[Shebarshin] Of course not.

[Kadulin] Even your driver did not protect you?

[Shebarshin] He was just an ordinary driver. I simply was not offered a bodyguard, I was not one of those people given protection.

[Kadulin] Can you tell me our intelligence service's biggest success in recent years.

[Shebarshin] No, I cannot. Our successes become known only when we suffer a major defeat. I hope that our real successes will not become known for at least 50 years. Intelligence has no right to boast. Of course, we can celebrate quietly among ourselves, but even to hint of successes means exposing someone to risk.

[Kadulin] What are your relations like with General Kalugin, former chief of First Chief Directorate internal counterintelligence?

[Shebarshin] He worked at the First Chief Directorate until the end of 1979. Relations between us then were like an ordinary staffer meeting a big chief. That is, I did not communicate with him, he communicated with me. This happened very rarely. Mainly when he was speaking from a platform when I listened to him from the audience. There was a substantial proportion of truth in his criticism of the First Main Directorate.

[Kadulin] In that case, how do you explain the First Chief Directorate leadership's negative attitude toward Kalugin?

[Shebarshin] We did not know when and where he would stop, whether he would begin revealing our sources or exposing our agents, even after the event. But he did not do that.

[Kadulin] Incidentally, Oleg Danilovich once described the existence in the KGB of a secret laboratory number 14 controlled by Chebrikov and engaged in the manufacture of murder weapons, including the poison umbrella with which the Bulgarian dissident Markov was killed in London. Do you know anything about this laboratory?

[Shebarshin] I do not. There is no such laboratory in the First Chief Directorate. I know of the Markov affair only from Western press reports and Kalugin's stories. I did not investigate this matter.

[Kadulin] Why?

[Shebarshin] I do not want to know more than I need to know for my work.

[Kadulin] Perhaps you know something about the whereabouts of Erich Honecker? According to unverified information he tried to commit suicide. Do you know about that?

[Shebarshin] I, too, have heard about that. When the decision to take him to the USSR was being made we were not consulted, and if we had been we would have recommended not getting mixed up in this case but seeking legal means conforming with the situation. I tried to ensure that First Chief Directorate intelligence was not embroiled in this affair even though on Kryuchkov's orders one of our comrades was sometimes enlisted to work with Honecker as an interpreter.

[Kadulin] Is it true that several years ago the Americans buried on intelligence center territory a device filled with espionage equipment which gave them detailed information on everything that was happening at the First Chief Directorate?

[Shebarshin] No, this device was discovered near Moscow either on a military airfield or somewhere else, perhaps not even near Moscow at all... I no longer remember exactly. I only know that we never found anything like it.

[Kadulin] Garri Tabachnik [name as transliterated] in his book "The Last Masters of the Kremlin" writes about the existence within the First Chief Directorate of subunit "T," which prepared and carried out assassinations abroad of people whom the USSR disliked. Is there something like that in the First Chief Directorate?

[Shebarshin] The intelligence service does not carry out assassinations and we do not train people for that purpose. We do indeed have a special subunit for emergency situations abroad: wars, the taking of hostages, the seizure of embassies, transport hijacks.

[Kadulin] Leonid Vladimirovich, I have been told that during the putsch you issued to First Chief Directorate staffers the text of the Law on the State of Emergency, thereby giving them an opportunity to understand the true nature of the State Committee for the State of Emergency? Is that so?

[Shebarshin] Initially it was hard to work out what was what... I am no lawyer, nor are my colleagues, so I asked for the text of the law to be found so that it could be studied. Clearly it was then duplicated and handed around. I do not remember whether I asked for the text to be duplicated and handed out, I only remember that I asked for it to be found and studied.

[Kadulin] Could you then at least clarify the situation on the special diversionary subunit entrusted to you which, according to our information, Kryuchkov ordered to be sent to the Russian "White House"?

[Shebarshin] Kryuchkov's order was not to send it into action but to send it from the base near Moscow to the Dzerzhinskiy club at the Lubyanka. When the subunit commander informed me that they could be sent into

action against the "White House" I ordered him not to obey any instructions or orders without consulting me, and on the evening of the 20th I categorically forbade him to carry out any orders connected with an offensive against the "White House" and that if such an order were given he must immediately inform me.

[Kadulin] Leonid Vladimirovich, people are saying that you resigned knowing that your dismissal was inevitable and was already being prepared.

[Shebarshin] I do not know. Maybe it was being prepared, maybe not. In any event I was put in the kind of situation where I believe I made the only right choice. I was treated intolerably crudely, even insultingly. You cannot treat an intelligence chief like that. But that is not the main thing. The main thing, as I see it, is that the old, almost forgotten ways are being restored when people are appointed to leading posts in the intelligence service not on the basis of professional qualities but favoritism.

[Kadulin] Surely this was the most bitter day in the career of intelligence officer Shebarshin?

[Shebarshin] I have had worse days, there have been very bitter failures.

I admit absolutely sincerely: I did not conceive of myself in any other life, I did not imagine what resignation would be like. I doubt that it will be easy to create for myself the kind of workload that I have become accustomed to. I have always read, written, and worked more easily under pressure of a deadline. I could not stand holidays and weekends. But now my whole life is one big weekend.

[Kadulin] None of the high-ranking KGB staffers with whom I have talked about your resignation could tell me when the president signed the decree on your dismissal, but Bakatin ordered that you be assigned to personnel administration. Nevertheless, what happened with your dismissal?

[Shebarshin] I was told about by phone. Bakatin clearly did not have time to phone and announce his decision. Someone from his secretariat said that there was a decree on the dismissal.

[Kadulin] Recently I have quite often heard an explanation of the mistakes made by the USSR president: His immediate entourage kept him in an 'information blackout.'

[Shebarshin] There is absolutely nothing that I can add on that score. All the information went from the First Chief Directorate to the chairman, he signed the telegrams and sent them on to their destinations. I had no opportunity to see whether the president was informed or not.

[Kadulin] How do you regard the idea of removing the First Chief Directorate from the composition of the KGB and reorganizing it as the Committee on Intelligence?

[Shebarshin] An absolutely correct idea. But there is the following danger. In the interval between adopting the decision and implementing it, the people running things in the interim might try to law down the methods for reorganizing intelligence and its cadre policy.

I have always believed that intelligence work is a vital, fragile, and very delicate organism which cannot tolerate sudden movements.

Primarily there is what we call the intelligence-gathering or agent network, that is, foreigners who cooperate with us. Then there are the operational workers stationed abroad under various forms of cover. There are the technical facilities. And, finally, the central apparatus. All these components are interconnected.

[Kadulin] One of the first "reforms" undertaken by the new KGB leadership was to transfer the Government Communications Directorate and the Eighth Directorate, which works on encoding and decoding, from KGB jurisdiction. Does it not seem to you that the committees' remaining subunits are thus left without reliable and proven communications channels? Was it not easier to set up parallel structures: so that the president could make use of one, the committee the other?

[Shebarshin] In my view, this is a prime example of a spur-of-the-moment decision which now needs to be reconsidered.

[Kadulin] In your view how will the sovereign republics, for example the Ukraine, carry out intelligence work? On the basis of the disbanded First Chief Directorate or their own First Directorates?

[Shebarshin] On the basis of their own First Directorates. As for the Ukraine, I know that they have potential for work abroad and we have cooperated very well.

[Kadulin] Some republic leaders are calling for the KGB archives and agents' names to be made public. Do you think that is justified in any form?

[Shebarshin] That is the final straw for the intelligence officer or the state security officer. These people worked for the state, that is, for you and me. And to divulge their names simply because circumstances have changed is base.

[Kadulin] Do you know anything about the CPSU's gold?

[Shebarshin] The First Chief Directorate took no part in any CPSU financial dealings.

[Kadulin] The CIA budget is $30 billion. The First Chief Directorate budget has not been published but it is widely believed to be much smaller. Can you confirm that?

[Shebarshin] If the First Chief Directorate budget were published it would seem improbable to many people that this service could cost so little and yet achieve so much.

CPSU's Ivashko on Party's Current Status

PM0310141191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 91 Single Edition pp 1, 3

[Interview with V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by A. Ilin "in PRAVDA's Editorial Office"; date not given; first four paragraphs are introduction; according to a footnote "Publication royalties will be credited to the PRAVDA Support Find": "Vladimir Ivashko: 'The People Will Pay for Any Coups...'"]

[Text] In recent years the CPSU's fate has been developing in a truly tragic way. With the start of perestroyka in society it gradually and then rapidly started lagging behind the changes taking place in the country. Having previously been the backbone of state administration, the party was unable to find its place in the conditions of political pluralism and to overcome the conservative-bureaucratic nature of its structures. This alienated democratic forces from it and caused a mass exodus of progressively inclined people from its ranks. By the middle of this year it had lost over 4 million party members.

PRAVDA has repeatedly written about the crisis in the party and its lagging behind perestroyka. We hoped that honest conclusions would be drawn from defeats and failures, and that a radical transformation of the CPSU into a party of political action would begin. Hopes strengthened when the new draft program was elaborated, on whose basis the party was, as it were, to discover itself anew and interpret its history, taking from it everything vital and valuable and irrevocably rejecting everything that was dead and obsolete. And it was to step—no, to leap—toward a new quality.

This process was tragically interrupted by the August events. At first by the statements of the State Committee for the State of Emergency, which were directed (and this should be especially stressed) also against the party's democratic renewal. After the failure of the putsch, the party was suspended because CPSU Central Committee members turned out to be among the plotters. Essentially without an investigation or trial, a leading political organization was outlawed. A cloud of shame hung over millions of Communists. Republic communist parties separated from the CPSU one after another, and some of them have already changed both their name and their bearings...

The current situation and the reasons behind it are the subject of an interview in PRAVDA's Editorial Office with V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Ilin] Vladimir Antonovich, after the former general secretary relinquished his powers, by dint of circumstances you found yourself heading a suspended party. What are you working on now, what worries and concerns you most of all?

[Ivashko] Yes, a role unprecedented in our party's history fell to me. A bitter role, it cannot be denied. But I assume that I have no right to leave my post now. The CPSU's activity was suspended by the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution of 29 August—moreover, for an unspecified period and without any constitutional grounds. Nobody can give us a competent explanation—evidently, there is plainly and simply no such explanation.

Nevertheless, the resolution itself exists, and it is quite obvious that any political activity within the framework of previously existing structures could be classified as illegal. And, of course, with all the ensuing consequences.

[Ilin] And the presumption of innocence? After all, it is not the accused, in whose role Communists have found themselves, who must prove their innocence, but the reverse—their accusers have to present their arguments. But somehow they do not seem too worried about this. As a matter of fact, some people are arguing highly originally that the CPSU must stand trial not only for the alleged "Communist putsch," but also on aggregate as it were—for all its history, including the crimes of Stalinism too...

[Ivashko] Political motives can be glimpsed here. And yet the resolution talks about the need to investigate the quite specific circumstances connected with the August events.

Something else worries me most of all. For decades on end, millions of people's fates were linked to the party's activity. These people, who were not in any way involved in any putsches or any other political storms at the "summits" of state power and administration, have now found themselves in the position of hostages of the attempted coup's organizers. Is that really fair? An investigation of all the circumstances of the coup's preparation, organization, and execution is in progress. When it is completed, conclusions of one sort or another will be drawn which are subject, as I understand it, to legal review.

In my opinion it is the civic and human duty of those whom fate has "drawn" into the party's leading organs in these dramatic circumstances to do everything possible to ensure that everything is fair. That people not involved in any illegal actions are not branded criminals just because they were committed to a particular political orientation and belonged to the CPSU.

Yet another grave concern—and this is precisely what I am also working on now—is about people who were working on the staff of party committees. The vast majority of them started working life in industry and agriculture, in higher educational establishments and

schools, and in scientific and cultural institutions. Then they were taken away, literally taken away—such was the practice—for party work. Now they have been put in an extremely complex position: Everything must be started anew, and that is not easy. In my opinion we are duty-bound to ensure that, if we are talking about a democratic society, legality is strictly observed in relation to them and that a neo-McCarthyist approach does not manifest itself, as is already occurring in some places.

[Ilin] All that is true. However, many of our readers put the question bluntly: Is the CPSU leadership thinking of getting the decision on the suspension of party activity rescinded? After all, this act is insulting to millions of honest Communists and angers them to the depth of their souls. Longstanding CPSU members Comrades Yelizavetin, Pechnikov, and many others have written to PRAVDA about this. They believe that they should not reconcile themselves to an undeserved accusation.

[Ivashko] I have already talked about this, only in different words. Alas, writing complaints will not help the cause. Who do we complain to? The former USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a decision on totally unknown grounds, whereupon it actually terminated its own existence. The extremely vague status of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee in the current situation makes an appeal there hopeless.

I repeat: Let the investigation proceed. If it is honest and objective, a conclusion about the noninvolvement of the vast majority of party members—and that means the party as a whole—in antistate activities is inevitable. Irrespective of the fact that people who are members of the CPSU's leading organs were mixed up in the August coup. The party did not give any instructions or recommendations to these people to take such action.

Naturally, it will take time to determine all the circumstances of August 1991. But time is also needed for people to understand and realize what qualitative changes have occurred in the party itself. And certainly not only during the ill-starred August days or immediately thereafter.

[Ilin] What do you mean?

[Ivashko] Let us turn back to the 28th CPSU Congress. The statutes adopted at it contain Paragraph 22, which proclaims republic communist parties' autonomy. Even at that time, although it was bashfully kept quiet, a step was taken toward the CPSU's federalization at the very least. In the year following the congress the process of the republics' sovereignization gathered momentum. This could not have failed to leave its mark on republic communist parties' activity as well. Just a push was needed for this process to acquire a very pronounced nature. The creation of new political organizations based on a number of republic communist parties was not extemporaneous but the result of what had recently happened in the republics. And the decisions on banning communist parties in some republics, on leaving the CPSU, and so on are no accident either—such are the dialectics of the processes taking places at local level.

On the other hand, some members of the CPSU itself and even of its leading organ—the Central Committee—in the recent past were people who in no way and by no stretch of the imagination could be described as sharing the same political ideas. Even on the most basic principles. For example, economists A. Sergeyev and O. Latsis were members of the Central Committee. But, in view of their ideological positions, could they really be in one and the same party? Of course not. A split was approaching. I believe it would have occurred at the congress, when the new CPSU Program was being approved. The most that could have been achieved would have been a breakaway of its extreme right and extreme left wings instead of the party's split into numerous parts. We were actually counting on that.

[Ilin] Judging by the initial reaction to the published draft program, this was entirely realistic. Many Communists started realizing that extremes amount to the same thing, that they are leading the party into a dead end. The general party debate which had only just started would, in my view, have helped people to perceive the party's place in the new political situation in society and the need for its cardinal transformation. The problems of the multiparty system and the rejection of the ideology of confrontation started being perceived differently, without panic or anguish, as was the case just a year ago. It seems that both the market and private ownership ceased being a bugbear for many people; the talk was mainly about the way to really ensure social protection for working people in these conditions and the role a party of Communists could play here.

It was exactly on Tuesday 20 August that the latest, 105th edition of "Diskussionnyy Listok" [Discussion Pamphlet] was due to appear in PRAVDA, and most of it was devoted to discussion of the draft program. And suddenly—the statement by the State Committee for the State of Emergency, the introduction of a state of emergency. This blocked the way of preparations for the 29th congress and cut off the oxygen to the partywide debate.

[Ivashko] Yes, our plans were not fated to materialize. And yet it is impossible to stop the development of political processes. Look at Russia's history—neither czarism nor Stalinism were able to halt them.

I am convinced that progressively minded and democratically inclined people—including young people—who are committed to the socialist orientation will rally around the humanist and democratic ideas of the draft new party program. New leaders and their supporters could become a kind of of successors to the party's recent program output and rally around it a sociopolitical movement in support of working people's interests. In my view, the future lies in this and not in a labyrinth of legal stratagems.

[Ilin] However, you certainly cannot do without jurisprudence. For example, there are now many claimants to

CPSU property and some of them are operating high-handedly, circumventing the law. There are even more conjectures and rumors. About some gold belonging to the party, about deposits abroad running into billions, and so on. Has all this got even the slightest basis in fact?

[Ivashko] There is a Russian proverb: Money likes an account. This is our starting point.

For many decades the party was an element of the state structure, which was unshakable. And therefore the idea of creating an underground financial base for the party is hardly likely to have occurred to any of its leaders—Brezhnev, Andropov, Chernenko. No such facts are known to me at least. And recently the money started running out—all the republic, kray, and oblast party organizations were existing on subsidies. The available reserves would have lasted at most three-four years if existing party structures were to be maintained. Incidentally, this was openly said both at the 28th congress and at Central Committee plenums. You also know that recently party committees were allowed—strictly within the framework of current legislation—to engage in economic and commercial activities. For the purpose of self-sufficiency and not to make some incredible profit. The party's cash flow was augmented in particular by revenues from party publishing houses. And, of course, by membership dues. All this is liable and subject to financial scrutiny. Let it be carried out. As I understand it, its results, both for financial resources and for property, buildings, and so on must be reviewed judicially, if required. And in no other way. Simply giving something away to somebody—nobody in the party is authorized to do that and cannot do that. Property belongs to the whole party and not to any individual person.

Regarding the increasingly widespread rumors about the transfer of 280 billion rubles abroad and the handing over of $3 billion to the leader of a foreign power... The figures cited are astronomical so as to strike the ordinary man's imagination as powerfully as possible and to jolt his nerves. This is ill-intentioned fantasy. The order of magnitudes itself is unrealistic. The party has never had such sums. And there was nowhere it could have gotten them from.

It is possible that some party members did commit abuses. I do not intend to defend anyone simply because they had a party card. But, I repeat, the party is totally uninvolved. Party funds, their sources, the way they are used—all this is subject to scrutiny.

[Ilin] I recall that one of Hemingway's poems (he wrote verse too) has the following line: "It is not we who are guilty. We will be found guilty." Many people—I know this from letters and telephone calls—have a sense of doom. Guilty or not, it does not matter—the verdict of the party's guilt is predetermined. Some people, without waiting for any investigation or trial, are calling Communists criminals. They say that to belong to such a party is immoral. And we go on and on justifying ourselves... And so my interview with you has, I would say, a somewhat apologetic nature.

[Ivashko] I cannot agree with that. Honest people have nothing to fear. The wave of turbid foam around the party will, I am convinced, subside sooner or later.

[Ilin] The harsh nature of complaints against the CPSU can largely be attributed to the fact that for years on end it was deemed infallible and it was unsafe to criticize it. Now that this can be done without looking over one's shoulder, all sorts of things are becoming supercharged. The same accusation of supporting the putsch—where will all these expressions end!

[Ivashko] The printed draft of the new party program clearly and unambiguously says: "...No single responsible political organization has the right to seek to achieve society's violent reconstruction." I think this contains the main key toward understanding the party's role and position in the August events. Individual people are one thing, the party as a whole is quite another.

Without going into details, I want to firmly state the following. Preparations for the coup d'etat were carried out by its perpetrators in profound secrecy, including from the party's legally elected collective leadership organs. No resolutions or other documents even remotely connected with the coup's preparation and organization were drafted, discussed, or adopted by a plenum, or the Politburo, or the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat. The party's leadership organs did not authorize anyone to participate in any illegal changes to the organs of state power and administration.

Let a court determine the guilt of individuals. But it must remove the stigma from innocent people. As regards my assessments of these events, they stem from the centrist position which I have consistently upheld while working both in the Ukraine and—for one year—in the CPSU Central Committee. If anyone is interested I can refer them to the texts of my reports at the Central Committee plenums last October and this January and of my articles in the press. True, I gained no political dividends from centrism—it was sharply criticized by both the left and the right.

I am against any coups: left or right, revolutionary or counterrevolutionary. They should not happen in contemporary society, since they are always anticonstitutional.

But that is not the whole of the matter. Ultimately it is the people who pay for any coups at the top of the "powers that be."

Only hard work and the reformation of the economic base in accordance with the demands of the time and on the basis of a sober sociopolitical and economic analysis, and not turbulence in the superstructure or civil shocks, will help to extricate our country from the crisis.

Media & Journalism

Journalist Bemoans Failure of TASS Reform

PM0310114191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 27 Sep 91 p 3

[Vyacheslav Chernyshev article under the "Continuing a Topic" rubric: "Ministry of Propaganda Or Center of Objective Information?"—last paragraph is editorial postscript]

[Text] "TASS: Fighting of local significance" (the weekly GOLOS [Voice]); "The old leadership of TASS has joined battle with the action group which advocates radical renewal of the information monster" (ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA); "The country must now make the switch from glasnost to freedom of the press, the agency's staffers have declared and have drawn this conclusion: 'TASS must be radically restructured'" (Germany's DPA); "The revolution has not happened at TASS" (Russian Television's "Vesti" program). Such diversity distinguishes the assessments which the Soviet and foreign world of journalism is making of the very turbulent events that have been occurring in recent weeks at TASS, which has traditionally attracted far less interest than its more conspicuous brother in the family of "state mass media"—the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. Although the question of whom this information giant has served, does serve, and will serve in the future merits very close attention by the whole of society. If only because the people's colossal funds have been and still are being spent on the creation and upkeep of its material and technical base, which is unique in the country, along with its vast Moscow staff and network of correspondents, which have elevated TASS to the ranks of world news services.

You cannot calculate the real size of these funds, rather than their worth on paper, either in terms of the annual state subsidy running to millions of rubles or in terms of a line in the budget or balance sheets in figures which long ago lost touch with the reality of the actual market, not to mention the multimillion-ruble appropriations in real freely convertible currency.

But this question is still more important because, however widespread the formula that is well known to everyone might seem, it is just: Information means power.

So, what has happened and is happening at TASS headquarters on Tverskoy Boulevard: A failed revolution or its prologue, a banal struggle for power or a tempest in a teapot which quickly petered out and gave way to the former stagnation?

According to one version, "a new epoch begins" at TASS with the arrival of the new general director, and he himself, backed by the opinion of the collective which expressed no confidence in the old leadership (although this opinion, alas, was far from uniform and certainly not that unequivocal), has come to fulfill the collective's will and not the will of the president who "released" him from the post of his press secretary. And, of course, to turn "this giant office, an establishment with its establishment customs," into "a creative organization which earns its living independently, without state subsidies" (ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 13 September 1991).

A different opinion was arrived at by the action group which advocated the agency's cardinal reform, the creation of a "new TASS," and its transformation from a state department into an independent news service on shareholding principles (with the widest possible number of founders) and obeying only the law, the principle of freedom of the press, and its professional and civic duty. And with the start of the "new epoch," which has, in point of fact, melted away.

Let us not dissemble. By the will of the higher wise leadership a knight in the whitest of clothes could ride on a white charger into the commanding office of TASS, most sincerely promising the TASS staffers and the whole of society henceforth "only a free flow of information." But what if the political situation changes tomorrow in our far from stable country and another shuffling of chairs and changing of offices takes place? Who then will ride what up to the leading sixth floor of TASS?

Particularly as prescriptions and models which have been rejected by life itself were the starting point for the "new epoch"—in this case the statute and the corresponding resolution on TASS which came into being back in April deep within the now defunct Cabinet of Ministers. The resolution extends the agency's financial independence and provides it with tax concessions by comparison with rival agencies. But all the real levers of control remain with one and only one owner.

It is possible to remove or put on the muzzle, lengthen or shorten the lead. But the collar should be taken off.

It is also an alarming fact that it is not some "self-styled group" that is being entrusted with working out and introducing reforms but an entirely official commission consisting, with a minimal (and, most likely, ornamental) exception, precisely of that "old leadership which stood at the helm of the TASS ship" and reduced it to such a deplorable state. In short, TASS, which yesterday was "an inalienable part of the totalitarian system," will today become an equally "inalienable" part of democratic society without essentially changing anything.

Blessed are the believers. But we would like to believe. Not in declarations about the right to free speech, creativity, and independence but in the emergence of reliable guarantees—legal, administrative, and financial. Their creation will in any case be a long, complex, and painful process. But the course is, on the whole, known and has been worked out in world practice, in the activities of those news agencies whose "commodity" dominates the world information market above all

because people believe it. This is the course of eliminating the news agency's serflike dependence on just one master—it is not important whether he is good or cruel; on just one source of funding; of ridding it of the functions of a "mouthpiece" of power in the name of its role as "general correspondent" for all the newspapers and journals, governments and parties which believe it equally.

Let us leave presidents and governments their press services. But, all the same, we will still need to build a truly national news agency, all of us together, so that no one is caused to smile a bitter smile by the question: By whom is it authorized to speak and what is it authorized to say?

P.S. The long-awaited volte-face which has supposedly occurred has forced the author of these lines, as "a representative of the self-styled action group" (this is how NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA deigned to put it), who has worked at TASS for more than 20 years, to place on the new general director's desk an application for dismissal at his own request (which was met) for the following reasons, in particular: "Being profoundly convinced of the long-urgent need to transform TASS into an independent mass medium and of the opportunity which has really emerged of finally embarking in practice on such a radical reform of the agency, I have been forced to note with alarm that it is failing. Not only will this opportunity be missed but the building of the new TASS will also be supplanted by its pseudoreform. As a result, TASS will essentially remain a ministry of propaganda and information, and its staffers will remain officials of a department, not journalists."

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's New Backer

PM0310150191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 91 p 3

[Interview with Andrey Zavidiya by I. Savvateyeva under the rubric "Millionaires' Life-Styles"; place and date not given: "Andrey Zavidiya—the Man Who Could Buy SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA"]

[Text] The interest in this deal is understandable. A newspaper which for many years was a consistent and uncompromising opponent of private property has suddenly been "given away" to the ultimate private owner: The "Zavidiya" Firm and the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Trade Union Organization have become cosponsors of the publication.

As a result, Andrey Zavidiya, who once financed Mr. Zhirinovskiy's election campaign and whom the latter had named as his vice president should he win, is again in the public eye. I found all this doubly curious because I remembered today's co-owner of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA as a new cooperative member when he attended a "round table" of entrepreneurial pioneers at KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in 1988.

At the time Andrey Fedorovich was trading fruit and vegetables, but was looking for a bigger business venture and was very energetic and efficient. I recall that he was even rushing off to some "smoke-filled room" to close a deal for the purchase of squirrel skins for some sewn goods cooperative, which, it seems, ultimately collapsed. Now we were meeting once again at the publishing house, only two floors down. And the man whom I had remembered as just "any old cooperative member" here had his own small but separate office and his own phone, and we were no longer talking about tomatoes and squirrel fur...

My Name Is Unimpeachable

[Savvateyeva] Andrey Fedorovich, you have pledged to solve SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's financial problems—do you ultimately have the money?

[Zavidiya] After trading and purchasing activities were banned, we worked in the repair and installation of computer equipment. We made our first million doing this. In 1990 I opened my "Zavidiya" firm, and this firm later set up the "Goland" concern.

[Savvateyeva] What does your concern do specifically?

[Zavidiya] It is a kind of coordinating, organizational, and guidance center with a vast data bank. I have a computer at home, and I've recorded on diskette who I sold what to and for how much. We bring together people whose interests coincide, and take a 1-percent cut for ourselves—that's all.

[Savvateyeva] That is, people pay you for information?

[Zavidiya] Not at all, that's just one small aspect... Not just that, anyway. I can say without any false modesty that my name is unimpeachable in the business world. After all, I was one of the first. To all intents and purposes I now control hundreds of billions of rubles without signing any documents.

[Savvateyeva] What kind of plants are part of your concern?

[Zavidiya] Any kind. There are hundreds of them. There's no point listing them for you.

[Savvateyeva] And are you also working for this concern now or have you immersed yourself completely in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's problems?

[Zavidiya] Look, I am the owner of the "Zavidiya" private firm, which founded the "Goland" concern and now sponsors SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA too. It is a small firm with a huge turnover. And in the very near future we will be founding another, far larger firm. We want to influence all forms of the economy and, ultimately, politics.

I Am a Future President

[Savvateyeva] Do you want to move into politics?

[Zavidiya] Definitely. I am a future candidate for USSR president. People would like to see me as an independent candidate representing the hundreds of enterprises with which I work. Representatives visited me personally, wrote me letters, and telephoned. Naturally, I gave my consent.

[Savvateyeva] Could you name just one or two enterprises prepared to nominate you?

[Zavidiya] No, it's too soon as yet. The fact is that, given the current instability in the political situation, my operatives at local level could start having difficulties: The democrats wouldn't leave them in peace. After all, I have been, am, and will continue to be a Communist.

[Savvateyeva] How do you square to your own satisfaction the ideology of enterprise with your communist views of private property?

[Zavidiya] As far as I'm concerned—it's simply marvelous! The idea behind all of communism is to move toward a bright future and get rich—and private property helps us do that.

[Savvateyeva] But, nonetheless, what remains of communism if you take away the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the struggle against private property?

[Zavidiya] Well, common human interests, at least. A purely spiritual proximity. After all, capitalism makes wolves of everybody. I've been in business for four years and I must say that there are plenty of rogues and thieves in it. And, in my opinion, if the majority of cooperatives, private firms, and joint ventures were headed by Communists the situation would improve.

[Savvateyeva] But Communists used to head most enterprises. And there was also a problem of rogues then, it seems...

[Zavidiya] This means that the system did not provide any opportunities. The pressure exerted by the CPSU's monopoly was very bad. But what do we see today? A democratic monopoly! This is ridiculous, absurd. They have destroyed the Union and are provoking bloodshed—rivers of blood are flowing! There is no doubt that all these structures which are currently in power should resign. Entirely new forces which are totally untainted should come to power... The borders of the USSR should be maintained as they are today—albeit without the Baltic. And we shouldn't let anybody else go so easily.

[Savvateyeva] What sections of the population do you plan to target in your election campaign?

[Zavidiya] Today I'm on the side of the losers. I will also target millions of rank-and-file Communists, nonparty people, Cossacks, and the private sector—after all, one in every two major businessmen knows me personally. I am on the side of the military-industrial complex, the KGB, and the militia. In short, I am on the side of all those who are currently finding life tough.

[Savvateyeva] Tell me, have you broken with Mr. Zhirinovskiy once and for all?

[Zavidiya] Yes. We parted company on a question of principle—I do not support his Great Russian chauvinistic sentiments.

[Savvateyeva] Andrey Fedorovich, don't you nonetheless feel that you are in some way the successor and follower of Vladimir Volfovich?

[Zavidiya] I agree. The main thing I have learned from him is courage.

The Newspaper Premises Are Protected, Thank God

[Savvateyeva] Did you cosponsor the newspaper so as to be able to propagandize your political views?

[Zavidiya] Given that we have helped it out of a bad patch, I think the newspaper will not refuse to publish my election program or to discuss it.

[Savvateyeva] Did you have to sacrifice a lot to help the newspaper out?

[Zavidiya] So far I haven't put a kopek into SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. I won't invest anything if I see that there'll be no profit.

[Savvateyeva] But you promised to pay off the 1.5-million-ruble debt "hanging" over the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA budget?

[Zavidiya] I would repeat that everything will depend on the prospects for commercial advantage. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA is currently in a very bad state. The publication is losing money and its accounts have been closed. But I think that any newspaper will be profitable if it is set within a commercial structure. Perhaps we should organize a joint-stock company based on the newspaper and even open our own bank. The premises are protected, thank God. In the future, of course, I would like to buy or acquire 51 percent of the shares. We'll see what happens...

[Savvateyeva] Are you planning to influence the content of the newspaper or cadre reassignments?

[Zavidiya] SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's new chief editor was elected the other day by secret ballot from among five candidates. Once again it will be Valentin Vasilyevich Chikin. I put no pressure on the vote. For a month now the journalists have been working in complete freedom and have experienced no pressure. However, in future they will undoubtedly have to choose between either complete freedom or my financial support. And if I invest my money, then I will dictate some of my own conditions correspondingly.

[Savvateyeva] People are saying that the CPSU provided the money for your concern to finance SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

[Zavidiya] We haven't had a single ruble from the CPSU. It is just that I have often visited the CPSU Central Committee and the Russian Communist Party Central Committee. I have even made a report there about the party's commercial activity. They invited me because I was one of the first entrepreneurs in the country—and a Communist to boot.

TASS Reviews 4 Oct Central Press

LD0410065291 Moscow TASS in English 0637 GMT 4 Oct 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 4 TASS—Today's newspapers carry reports from the country's "hot spots".

PRAVDA, in the article "Common Sense May Win," says the Georgian opposition's proposal to withdraw armed units from Tbilisi may stop the escalation of tension in the city.

The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper reports from Kishinev that Moldova, including the Dnester region, has welcomed the signing of conciliation protocols to stabilise the situation in the republic.

The situation remains tense in Tajikistan. PRAVDA reports an emergency session of the republic's parliament has turned down the opposition's demands.

The Soviet youth daily KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA publishes an interview with the Tajik opposition leader Khadzhi Akbar Turadzhonzoda.

The RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper publishes the first page of the manuscript of Mikhail Sholokhov's novel "And Quite Flows the Don".

Soviet writer Lev Kolodniy talks about the search for the manuscript.

The Soviet trade union daily TRUD offers an interview with Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev. "I think the liberal-party period is over and a period of the democratic revolution is on the rise. It gives Russia and the whole Union a chance to embark on the path of radical and truly democratic reforms. But it's only a chance," Kozyrev said.

Kazakhstan parliamentary leader E. Asanbayev told PRAVDA a draft economic agreement developed by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's team contains several controversial articles.

One of them deals with republican currencies. Asanbayev says it's not clear whether they will strengthen the ruble inside and outside the country or not.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA comments on the talks between republican leaders in Alma-Ata. Some of them opposed the word "union" in the phrase "an economic union of sovereign states," the newspaper says.

Russian trade unions have called for higher wages and salaries as the country moves towards a market economy. Igor Klochkov, leader of the Federation of Russia's Independent Trade Unions, told RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA the federation will hold mass rallies between October 21-26 to urge republican leaders to give firm guarantees of people's social protection.

The Soviet military daily KRASNAYA ZVEZDA offers a discussion of military service in the Navy on a contract basis.

PRAVDA publishes an interview with Yi Hwan-bin, director of the South Korean Institute of Science and Technology, in which he talks about South Korea's economic "wonder."

Economic

Leaders Comment on Results of Alma-Ata Meeting

Silayev Interviewed

LD0410072691 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2145 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Interview with Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Interrepublican Committee for Economic Management, by unidentified correspondent on an airplane flying from Baykonur to Moscow on 2 October; interview broadcast in progress—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] What are your first, most burning, clearest impressions or thoughts on the event that has just taken place?

[Silayev] What is most essential as far as I am concerned—with all due respect to this space flight—is yesterday's work, which was initially very difficult and even lacking in certainty at one time, but then it picked up speed and finished on a very upbeat note with the signing, or rather the initialling, of a draft treaty on an economic community of 12 republics, by all those who were present. Latvia was there, too, but it has already decided to work according to a different principle as a state. It is no longer a member of the Union. Moreover, there were points of such importance in this draft that made the signing of it difficult to imagine even theoretically.

There was a sort of free and very committed exchange of views, in which the republics visualized themselves in the future Union and in which no one was forcing anything on them. They even agreed to an entry stating more or less that real and genuine economic development and real success are unthinkable without private property. Of course, the participants still have to defend this in their parliaments and before their public. Our traditional upbringing—let's put it that way—is defective in its commitment to that which we were all taught for many years and which has failed. Nevertheless, all the republics agreed with the formulation that the route

to the development of the economy and prosperity is only possible via private property.

There were a number of other points that would certainly have been rejected if they had been proposed by the center. It is being proposed very seriously that banking functions be centralized, not at some sort of center, but through the creation of a special banking system not subordinate to any government, but functioning in the interests of the governments.

A very serious article was drawn up dealing with support for enterprises. Moreover, it is intended that conditions for enterprises are to be identical everywhere. I could list many bold articles, some even unexpected ones, which lay a foundation for future economic reform.

In fact, there was no program that could not have been recommended to all the republics. The "500 Days" program made for the Union was rejected. It did not come about. I think that what is laid down in this draft are very serious further advancements in comparison with the "500 Days" program. In particular, there is a definition of the role of private property. We did not dare to state that a year ago, because it was felt that this would not be accepted at all. Today the necessity has rung out even more acutely to have the possibilities to raise the question, due to the further worsening and even complete collapse, let's say, of the global, state structures. Today the public is more ready, although it will still be necessary to fight for this.

For this reason, I think that this is a remarkable event. For the first time, the republics themselves, without pressure, decided the principles of economic cooperation among themselves. If initially there were still voices saying: Won't vertical structures appear and won't we develop a new system that will pressure us, then in the end they practically unanimously said that coordinating, supporting structures that administer certain areas in the interests of those same republics are necessary. For this reason, I consider that a revolutionary change has taken place to the advantage of the republics' sovereignty and their understanding of the necessity of very profound coordination and cooperation in many spheres of activity. I think that a basis for the program for this transitional period of the way out of the crisis and the stabilization of the economy is outlined sufficiently clearly here.

These are my clearest impressions, especially since we went with the hope that it would be possible to achieve agreement of three, four, or at most five republics. We did not expect that all 12 would announce their intention to participate in this new economic community.

[Correspondent] Three republics have signed the agreement an hour ago. Could one describe this as a sensation?

[Silayev] I would not say so, because yesterday eight—it is true—including these three, stated the firm necessity and their intention to sign within 15 days. They have given further thought to everything. They have thought everything through. Dragging out the process when everything is clear and when any wasted time is at least unhelpful if not sometimes dangerous. They are confident that this is precisely what they need. They have taken the step and they have, as it were, implemented their intentions ahead of schedule.

[Correspondent] We know that Saburov, the representative of the Russian government, was also authorized by the president of Russia to sign the agreement. Why didn't Russia add its signature today?

[Silayev] No, that is not right. He was given authority to initial this treaty, which is what he did. From the very beginning the preliminary understanding was that as soon as the document was ready for signing—and it is now ready and three republics have signed it—he expressed his readiness to sign, among other things, there in Sochi. In order for that to happen, it is simply necessary to check what he and I discussed with Saburov when we were with Boris Nikolayevich last Saturday. The following day he sent us his notes supporting the main provisions of this draft treaty.

Inasmuch as in the course of yesterday's discussions... [changes thought] well, certain worries today... [changes thought] The fundamental principles maintained by Russia yesterday were made reality to a considerable extent in the final version. Today, too, certain nuances in it were considered. Today nothing is hindering Boris Yeltsin from signing the document.

[Reporter] Do you believe that 12 republics might sign this agreement?

[Silayev] I would first like to tell you that we were not even setting ourselves the task when drawing it up.... [changes thought] Well, I mean Grigoriy Alekseyevich [Yavlinskiy] and Yevgeniy Fedorovich [Saburov], who was also an active participant—he is, after all, a member of the operational management committee—and this document has been referred to the operational management committee. [sentence as heard] We were not setting ourselves the task of categorically having to get a result, come what may, so that everyone signed. That is the same old approach of setting a target, a task to be achieved by any means or methods, including arm twisting, to get people to sign. We set ourselves the task of getting a minimum of three or four to sign. That would constitute an economic union, an economic community. We had no doubt that once three or four had signed, the others, having familiarized themselves with this document or having taken part in refining it, would be bound to join. That is what happened, but it galloped along without any pressure or initiative on our part at all. We were astounded. We did not not expect that. However, it is very good and we welcome it.

[Reporter] Thank you.

[Silayev] You are welcome.

Yavlinskiy, Others Cited

PM0310131991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Oct 91 Union Edition pp 1,2

[Report by correspondents V. Ardayev and E. Matskevich: "The Results of the Meeting in the Kazakhstan Capital Surpassed All Expectations"]

[Text] An assessment of the results of the talks among the 13 republic leaders cited in our headline was made by Interrepublican Economic Committee Chairman I. Silayev.

The meeting, which began at around 1000 hours on 1 October, ended late at night. The work centered on a discussion of the draft treaty on an economic community within the framework of the former Union. Kazakhstan President N. Nazarbayev summed it all up at a press conference straight after the talks. He noted that in the course of a productive discussion of the draft by the heads of the sovereign states and the government heads, full agreement was reached on the major questions on which the authors of the document and official representatives of all the republics had failed to find a common view. There was then an intense discussion of all 58 articles. Taking into account certain comments made by some republics, it was agreed that the leaders of the 12 republics' governments would endorse (initial) the draft—in order that the heads of the sovereign states might then sign the treaty.

All the republic heads present at the meeting signed a joint communique revealing common approaches to current issues—such as human rights, interethnic relations, the economic situation, consolidation of society, movement toward the market, and so on. Eight republics—Russia, the Ukraine, Belarus, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan—adopted a statement expressing a willingness to sign the treaty on an economic community not later than 15 October. (It has to be said that two republics—Belarus and Kazakhstan—said they were willing to sign the treaty immediately—V. Ardayev and E. Matskevich). Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, and Moldova intend to add their signatures later—after the matter has been discussed in their parliaments and governments. N. Nazarbayev also noted that the draft treaty envisages various forms of entry into the community—on a federal or confederal basis, as an associate member. This provides extensive opportunities and effectively opens up all doors to free entry. Republics that have not signed the treaty are entitled to participate as observers.

Answering journalists' questions, G. Yavlinskiy said that the most heated arguments had been caused by the discussion of two items. Number one was what to call the future association of participants in the economic agreement: union, commonwealth, community. Number two was the procedure for appointing the chairman of the Interstate Economic Committee. But they managed to reach agreement in both cases. We would point out that the signs are that the term "economic union" will feature no longer—since the end of the talks the most frequent expression has been: "economic community." As for the second "stumbling block," G. Yavlinskiy explained that the current committee chairman, I. Silayev, was appointed by the USSR president; after the treaty has been signed, the appointment procedure envisaged by the treaty will be used—he will be appointed by the heads of the governments of the republics in the community and approved by the heads of the sovereign states that are members of the community.

"A remarkable event has occurred today," G. Yavlinskiy said. "Scarcely anyone in the country would have thought that the 12 republics would have agreed at the level of heads of government and in the presence of heads of state to initial the treaty. It is a rather extraordinary event and we believe that this Alma-Ata treaty is a real opportunity for us all."

The meeting participants noted that the achievement of an accord on an economic treaty among the republics could contribute to a positive change in the very ethics of relations between states—this is evidenced by the very fact that the leaders of such implacable adversaries as Azerbaijan and Armenia sat down at the same "round-table."

Here is the assessment of the meeting's results provided by I. Silayev before the press conference began:

"The results are impressive, surpassing many people's original expectations. But it is a very complex matter—fundamentally new economic relations among sovereign states which are planning to organize their work on the basis of the market, but, at the same time, taking into account mutual commitments and mutual responsibility for activities within the common economic space. Decisions were reached which appeared totally unattainable—including those on the banking system, on price policy, on enterprise support, on the acknowledgment that the economy will be based on private ownership. There are many other aspects whose depth is perhaps difficult to appreciate right away, but whose implementation can ensure both the stabilization of the econonmy and the development of market relations. M. Gorbachev did not come to the meeting, partly because the original intention had been to have a preliminary discussion at the level of government heads, and it was assumed that there would then have to be a decent period for consultations and elimination of differences of opinion.... Now the signing of the treaty on an economic community is a reality that is destined to come to pass literally in the next few days. Do you know, Moscow is no longer a synonym for center—conservative, in charge of all and sundry. Relations between states are now developing on a fundamentally new, democratic basis—there was not, in fact, even a chairman at the meeting, except for Nazarbayev, who conducted it, as host. Perhaps it would be a sensible idea to meet and tackle common problems in the future in the same way—on a "neutral ground."

The documents signed at the meeting include a bilateral Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation Between Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan.

On the morning of 2 October all the meeting participants left for the Baykonur space center.

Nazarbayev News Conference

PM0310134491 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Colonel A. Ladin on news conference by Kazakh President N. Nazarbayev following Alma-Ata talks, under general heading: "Meeting in Alma-Ata. N. Nazarbayev: We Have Reached a Consensus"]

[Text] As has already been reported, a meeting of leaders of 13 sovereign republics (excluding Lithuania and Estonia) has taken place in Alma-Ata.

At a press conference after the talks were over, Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] President N. Nazarbayev said that he believes the meeting was successful. Dwelling briefly on the situation that prevailed just prior to the arrival of the republics' delegations in Alma-Ata, Nursultan Abishevich frankly admitted that following consultations between the authors of the draft economic treaty between the republics, headed by G. Yavlinskiy, and plenipotentiary representatives from the republics, a number of questions arose which caused major disagreement on eight points. The quality of the document deteriorated to such an extent that it became unacceptable. At the same time it was necessary to have ready a Treaty on Economic Cooperation as quickly as possible. With winter approaching, a further deterioration in the economic situation cannot be allowed. So great hopes were placed on the meeting of republic leaders. And these hopes were justified.

N. Nazarbayev went on to state that after lengthy discussion of all 58 articles of the treaty, the contradictions were by and large removed and complete consensus was reached. The republics have remarks to make about some of the points. But the main thing has been achieved: All the delegation heads (Latvia declined to adopt the decision) agreed to initial the draft Treaty on the Economic Community. This is what it is called now. The name of the document was formulated after lengthy discussions and a vote.

During the meeting eight sovereign republics adopted a statement confirming that their top leaders will sign the draft Treaty on the Economic Community no later than 15 October. Moreover, the Kazakhstan president announced that he has had a talk with B.N. Yeltsin and—together with Belorussia—Kazakhstan and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] are prepared to sign this document immediately. The "doors" to signing the treaty remain open for the rest of the republics. They may adopt the same decision after consultations and discussions in their parliaments.

The journalists asked where the signing of the treaty by the heads of sovereign republics could take place. N. Nazarbayev proposed that this solemn act be performed in Tashkent. I. Karimov, president of the republic of Uzbekistan, immediately agreed to play host to the republic delegations.

Press representatives were interested to know which issue prompted the most argument among the participants at the meeting. G. Yavlinskiy said that the contentious issues included the procedure for appointing the chairman of the Interrepublic Economic Committee. Eventually consensus was reached. Ivan Stepanovich Silayev explained that the chairmen of Councils of Ministers and the prime ministers of the sovereign member-states of the economic community will nominate a candidate for chairman, and the supreme leaders of the republics will ratify the choice.

The Latvian delegation has declined to sign the draft Treaty on the Economic Community for the time being. Explaining the position it has adopted, Latvian Council of Ministers Chairman I. Godmanis said that at the present time the republic is seeking the right to associate membership of the EEC. We will, he said, work to conclude treaties with all the esteemed republics. Latvia will find a special procedure for concluding a treaty with the newly established economic community.

Answering a question about nuclear weapons, N. Nazarbayev said that the Semipalatinsk missile range has been closed and will be converted to form a science and technology complex. The nuclear installations that are in Kazakhstan will not be moved anywhere else. In line with the economic agreement, they will be under the control of a single army and a single center for the country's strategic arms.

Nazarbayev made it clear that M. Gorbachev was not invited to the meeting. He has been invited to the Baykonur cosmodrome, where a Kazakh cosmonaut was sent into space for the first time 2 October as part of a Soviet-Austrian crew. All the republic heads who participated in the Alma-Ata meeting will watch the spacecraft being launched.

Snegur, Karimov Assess Results

PM0310143491 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Moldovan President M. Snegur, and Uzbekistan President I. Karimov, by unnamed correspondent at the meeting of leaders of 13 sovereign republics in Alma-Ata; date of interviews not stated: "Meeting in Alma-Ata: It Is not the Last Chance, but Delay Is Unthinkable"]

[Text] In Alma-Ata on 1 October leaders of 13 sovereign republics (excluding Lithuania and Estonia) began a meeting, which, as we know, is being held on the initiative of Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] President N. Nazarbayev. A Declaration of Civil and

Interethnic Accord, an Agreement on the Principles of Trade and Economic Cooperation and the Implementation of Economic Ties in 1992, and also a communique on the results of the meeting were submitted for discussion. In the opinion of some of the participants, other documents might also be adopted.

Before the start of the meeting Kazakh SSR President N. Nazarbayev made a statement emphasizing that this is the first time such a meeting has been held outside Moscow. He went on to note that at the present time all the participants have the opportunity to lay a fundamentally new foundation for economic cooperation. This could be a successful joint launch into the future, the start of genuinely equal and mutually beneficial relations within the framework of a civilized democratic community.

"We must not let this opportunity slip," N. Nazarbayev said at the end of his statement.

G. Yavlinskiy is taking part in the meeting.

Our correspondent asked President M. Snegur and President I. Karimov to answer some questions about the meeting of the leaders of the 13 republics in Alma-Ata.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Can you tell us anything about the results of the talks that have begun?

[Snegur] I think most republics incline toward the view that an economic treaty is necessary without linkage to political aspects.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Did you come here willingly?

[Snegur] Of course.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Does the fact that Gorbachev is not presiding at the meeting set a particular tone for the talks currently in progress?

[Snegur] I think that this sets a positive tone. The idea of a meeting between leaders of the sovereign republics has long been in the air, and therefore there has been no discernible pressure from the center. The bonds have been broken, there is a chance for us to agree on our own how to live in the future and how to maintain relations within an integrated economy.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Do you think meetings like this one might become a regular feature?

[Snegur] I have proposed that these meetings should indeed be held regularly, in the capitals of the sovereign republics by turns, bearing in mind that Moldova favors the conclusion of a treaty on economic cooperation.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Is there mutual understanding at the Alma-Ata meeting or are you aware of different approaches to resolving the issues that have been raised?

[Snegur] I think that the difference in opinions, which does exist of course, is a sign of diversity of opinions. But not of a lack of coordination.

[Karimov] In my view, the main result of the meeting is the accord which will very soon be reached on the signing of an economic agreement allowing us to exploit the resource potential of each individual republic and the opportunities for trade and economic exchange and food product exchange with partners so that we can at least get through this winter. If each republic has to fight this crisis on its own, then who knows what might happen in the next two or three months.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What will serve as a guarantee for the implementation of the agreement which, it seems, will be reached at this meeting?

[Karimov] Mutual interest alone. It would not be right to build this using violence, diktat, pressure, or sanctions imposed by new control structures of some kind. We have already been through all this. We can only hope that republics' mutual interest in cooperating with one another will enable us to resolve all our problems.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Did you come to the meeting willingly?

[Karimov] I only came willingly because I studied as an economist. And I know what misfortunes await us in the very near future. We would be complete fools not to share our common concern today. Because we can only survive and emerge from the serious economic and political crisis in which the whole country finds itself through mutual joint subordination of our interests and reciprocal enrichment. Therefore we have to cast ambition aside and leave ideological questions firmly by the wayside. We must think of just one thing: what we have to do to enable our people to get through the winter and eventually settle down to normal work. Everyone wants this, everyone wants to live and believes that tomorrow will be better than today. But we cannot guarantee this, you know.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Gorbachev is not taking part in the meeting. From your point of view, do you think it normal that this meeting should take place without the USSR president?

[Karimov] I think it probable that Mikhail Sergeyevich is absent only because he is not sure of the results of the present talks. If he was sure that we were sufficiently prepared to get a constructive result, he would be here.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Do you think that this attempt to reach agreement in Alma-Ata is the last chance to find a proper way out of the crisis?

[Karimov] It is hard to say whether this is the last chance or not, but I think that any delay in adopting a decision about economic cooperation would be tantamount to suicide.

Eight Republics Sign Statement

PM0310150691 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[RIA report under general heading "Meeting in Alma-Ata. N. Nazarbayev: We Have Reached a Consensus"]

[Text] The agreements reached between republics on a bilateral and multilateral basis have initiated the formation by sovereign states of an economic space based on rational economic ties. This forms the subject of a statement signed 1 October by the leaders of eight of the 13 republics that participated in the meeting in the Kazakh capital—Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenia. In the statement they express their readiness to sign the Treaty on the Economic Community prior to 15 October. The statement notes that the process of creating a new economic environment, establishing its legal and organizational bases, and developing commodity-money and market relations is in progress. Any delay in signing the interrepublic agreement carries the risk of the collapse of the economy and the financial and credit system, and also a disastrously reduced standard of living for the population.

The signatories to the future interrepublic treaty are convinced that it will enable the socioeconomic situation to stabilize and radical reforms to be implemented. The remaining sovereign republics have been invited to reconsider their positions and accede to the new agreement.

Economic Committee Views Republics' Cooperation

LD0310230491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] There has been a session of the committee for the operational management of the country's economy in Moscow today. Details of this from our correspondent Valeriy Kiosa:

[Kiosa] At today's session Ivan Stepanovich Silayev commented upon the results of the Alma-Ata meeting of the leaders of the sovereign republics. As is well known, 12 republics initialed the text of a draft treaty on an economic community, and eight of them expressed their readiness to sign this document before 15 October.

Ivan Stepanovich Silayev today informed the members of the committee that yesterday three sovereign republics—Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Belarus—signed the treaty on an economic community. Among the main articles of this document, Silayev singled out a recognition of the fact that the bases for an upturn in the economy are private property, entrepeneurship, and competition. The states forming the economic community are to assume responsibility for guaranteeing on their territories an identical legal regime for entrepeneurs from their own state and from other states, and they are also to recognize the free circulation of goods and services throughout the entire territory of the community, and the fact that no restrictions of any sort are permissible in this area.

Ivan Stepanovich Silayev noted in particular the principle of preserving the ruble as the community's common currency. Alongside this, the introduction of national currencies is permissible if special agreements are reached between the member-states of the economic community.

According to the draft document, the institutions of this community are to be the council of heads of government of the states involved, the inter-republican economic committee, and the banking union, alongside which an interstate emissions bank is to be established.

One more important point on today's agenda was information from Yuriy Mikhailovich Luzhkov about the inter-republican agreement on the issue of foodstuffs. This document contains agreements on the reciprocal amounts of inter-republican deliveries, the allocation of imported foodstuffs, and many other issues. The draft agreement on the issue of foodstuffs has already been signed by 10 republics; but up to the present time, the Ukraine, whose participation according to Luzhkov was limited to the role of observer in the working group, has not defined its position.

The deputy chairman of the committee suggests there is nothing serious in the fact that one republic or another might not sign this agreement; but clarity is called for, even more so since the Western partners with whom talks are now being held about the delivery of foodstuffs have expressed their readiness to conduct business with only one partner—that is, the Union.

And how are the authors of this draft intending to guarantee its implementation? This is our constant failing—the failure to implement agreements. The draft document proposes that if some product or other is not delivered, then the republic guilty of this will have to pay the cost entailed by this failure to deliver in freely convertible currency, at world prices.

I would like to note that should it be signed, this agreement is to remain in effect until the harvest in the coming year, after which it will either be extended or the sovereign republics will independently settle their foodstuff problems. Taking into account the urgency of this issue, the committee for the operational management of the economy has adopted a resolution to study the draft treaty on the provision of foodstuffs before the beginning of next week so that it will be ready to be submitted for examination by the State Council.

Operational Committee Discusses Nuclear Industry

PM0310102391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 91 Union Edition p 1

[V. Romanyuk report: "'Provisional Government' Keeps Unified Leadership of Nuclear Power Engineering"]

[Text] The usually radical members of the Committee for the Operational Management of the USSR National Economy reacted with restraint to the proposal from the Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry's proposal that its structure be reorganized. Most people advocated preserving the unity of nuclear power engineering, which comes under strict central control.

This was perhaps the first time that I did not hear debates about ownership rights at a session of this kind. Everyone realizes that the nuclear complex cannot be divided up by nationality. Only with unified control can the country's nuclear and radiation safety be ensured and can there be guarantees that there will be no repeat of Chernobyl at one of the 46 AES [nuclear electric power station] power units. World class fundamental nuclear physics cannot be subdivided. The some 30 international nuclear nonproliferation commitments that the country has made cannot be subdivided. Income from component exports, which now totals $650 million a year could be subdivided, for instance, however it is more logical to keep unified export policy and international scientific and technical ties.

The proposal from the sector's leaders amounted to adapting the nuclear power engineering management system to the reality of republic sovereignty. This idea failed to win support from the committee. The shadow of Chernobyl, as it were, loomed over the room. Someone described as insanity the very idea of privatizing an enterprise that produces nuclear weapons or their components.

A fairly delicate situation has developed: The republics have made concerted efforts to dismantle many Union structures but it is becoming clear that it is dangerous to raze things "to the ground." Moreover, centralized structures must be reinforced. It is no coincidence that the USSR's unified power network has long been the envy of the entire civilized world. Its uninterrupted operation eases the results of the most serious accidents.

As for amalgamating AES's into a single corporation, world experience of setting up transnational companies confirms the effectiveness of structures of this kind. Both safe operational structure and technical policy must be based on unified principles. The property can remain republic property but nothing prevents it being leased to various interrepublic corporations. And thus relieving the republic authorities of their "headache."

Summing up the discussion, I. Silayev warned once again against shenanigans with new structures. A centralized management organ is indisputably essential for nuclear power engineering and the republics are sufficiently aware to realize that an agreement must be reached, resolving all the associated legal matters at the same time. The conclusion is clearcut: Property can be shared out, as can profits, but people's safety and the country's international prestige cannot.

Abalkin Reports Fivefold Increase in Deficit

LD0310200291 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Oct 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Leonid Abalkin, formerly Gorbachev's chief economic adviser, has stated that the government has only one month remaining to take decisive measures to stabilize the economy. After that, the process of disintegration will become complete and uncontrollable. In Abalkin's view, the low point of economic disintegration should be reached in the spring. The economist said that the budget deficit has increased fivefold compared with last year, and amounts to 15 percent of the gross national product.

Economic Committee Drafts Food Agreement

LD0410000891 Moscow TASS in English 2148 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS commentator Boris Grischenko]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—Deputy chief of the Soviet economic mAnagement committee Yuriy Luzhkov told a meeting of the committee today that work to draft an economic agreement on the republics' food supply was completed. The document defines volumes of food and agricultural raw material supplies to the inter- republican centralised fund.

The agreement establishes volumes of products to be brought in and taken out of each of the republics and the size of inter- republican supplies of basic foodstuffs and raw material. The draft was already signed by ten republics. The Ukraine is among those who has not yet agreed with it.

The draft establishes an effective mechanism for implementing the agreement. It says, in part, that if a republic falls short of meeting the target, it pays the cost of food and raw material in convertible currency and at world prices. This agreement is expected to be in force until the next harvest.

Commenting on the main provisions of the document, Luzhkov emphasised it should become one of the key elements of the economic agreement adopted at the Alma-Ata meeting.

The meeting, which was chaired by Ivan Silayev, gave the republics several days to wrap up work on the food agreement.

Ten Republics To Sign

OW0410005691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2341 GMT 3 Oct 91

[From "Soviet Business Report"; Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Ten Soviet republics are ready to sign a draft interrepublican economic agreement on food that will be

considered at the next sitting of the State Council, said Moscow Vice Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov. The Ukraine and the Baltics said they opposed the project. Azerbaijan is expected to support it, said Mr. Luzhkov.

The new agreement penalizes failure to meet obligations with fines in hard currency in accordance with world market prices.

Until mid-1992, the USSR needs around 10.5 billion rubles in credits to buy food (40 million tons of grain), said Mr. Luzhkov. The credits must be guaranteed both by the Union and the republics, and the food will be distributed via centralized structures.

First Cellular Telephone System Launched

OW0310133691 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Sep 91

[Report by V. Batalov from the "Utro" program—recorded]

[Text] While we attempt to use the telephone's rotary dial to contact Moscow without success—not to mention foreign cities—the Mayor of St. Petersburg, Anatoliy Sobchak, in one minute, literally, contacted the Mayor of Seattle, Norman Rice. [video shows Sobchak using a mobile telephone]

The joint enterprise Delta Telecom, which comprises the City Telephone Network, the Technical Control Station, and the American firm U.S. West, has created the first commercial cellular telephone system in Russia. [video shows banks of circuitry, people at personal computers, a "Mobira" brand portable cellular telephone, and people using cellular phones]

It seems that not only we, but also American businessmen, have grown tired of wasting time using the telephone's rotary dial without result. Now, owners of such mobile systems—one can even use them in a car—have the opportunity to contact any city.

True, it is not cheap. It costs 2,000, just for its installation; then add to this a monthly payment of 195, and all of this is in dollars. Only enterprises, SP's [Joint Stock Enterprises], and cooperatives can afford such expenditures. Nevertheless, there is no dearth of those who want one.

Military

General Staff Reacts Positively to Bush Proposals

LD0310143491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Report by Radio Moscow military observer Captain Aleksandr Yakovlev—read by announcer]

[Text] On instructions from the Soviet president, Mikhail Gorbachev, a special group has been set up in Moscow to respond to George Bush's nuclear disarmament initiative. Part of the group are Soviet military leaders. More from a Radio Moscow military observer, Captain Aleksandr Yakovlev.

I have been to the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, says Aleksandr Yakovlev. The staff are scrutinizing the American proposals, comparing them with the initiatives this country put forward earlier. Back in January of 1986, Moscow advanced a program to move to a nuclear-free and nonviolent world stage by stage. The initiative of the American President to bring about radical nuclear disarmament naturally evoked a positive response. Let's listen to the chief of a department [the Treaty and Legal Directorate] of the General Staff, Lieutenant General Fedor Ladygin:

[Begin Ladygin recording in Russian with superimposed translation into English] I'd like to say President Bush's proposals met the proposals that this country has repeatedly put forward over some years, proposals for ground- and sea-based nuclear weapons and tactical nuclear arms in general. An American delegation is arriving in Moscow one of these days. It will include representatives of the American military leaders. I hope the Soviet side will have prepared its own proposals by that time, to ban nuclear tests in particular. Let me say the Soviet countermeasures will jibe with the American in terms of their scope. We'll carry out some unilaterally. For example, following Washington the Soviet Union decided to remove from combat duty the ballistic missiles that fall under the START treaty.

The two sides will have to coordinate their positions to reach understanding, because first the Soviet nuclear arsenals and the America's [as heard] arsenals are poles apart in terms of quality, and second, we cannot but take into account the French and British nuclear forces in Europe. There is much work to be done, but I do hope for success. At any rate, the General Staff believe Moscow takes as much interest as Washington in bringing down nuclear arsenals to a minimum. [end recording]

Shaposhnikov: 3 Million 'Reasonable' Troop Level

LD0210213591 Paris Antenne-2 Television Network in French 1900 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Text] Five days after the announcement of the reduction in nuclear forces presented by George Bush, the Soviet Union has not made any new committment in this direction. The measures announced today only concern the size of the Soviet Army. By 1994, they will be brought down from 4 million to 2.5 million men. The infantry will be the most affected. General Grachev, the Soviet first vice defense minister, quoted by the INTERFAX agency in Moscow, gave this information while describing as dangerous the desire of several republics, especially the Ukraine, to have their own armed forces. The East-West detente and the first important step by the American President to continue disarmament undoubtedly sped up the Soviet decision, as Marshal Shaposhnikov let Antenne-2 know recently:

[Begin Shaposhnikov recording in Russian fading to French translation] We are not an exception. We foresee a reduction in our forces. I think that at the moment the reasonable size of our armies should not exceed 3 million men, at the most. As you know, there are discussions in Vienna on the mutual reduction of armed forces. We made some estimates concerning this. We do not find a need, yet we are still ready to carry out this mutual reduction as other countries are doing. If this reduction comes into effect the Soviet Army will not have more soldiers than the American Army but will still be four times larger than the French Army. [end recording]

Ministry Confirms 27 Sep Submarine Accident

LD0210205491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1926 GMT 2 Oct 91

[By correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Oct (TASS)—The USSR Ministry of Defense press center has confirmed that an accident took place. According to their information, on 27 September a submarine belonging to the Northern Fleet put out into the White Sea to launch a training missile. Due to a technical fault, an explosion took place in the missile tube. No one was killed or injured. Fragments of the launching device were scattered into the sea by the force of the explosion.

The press center also stated that rumors about rocket fuel spilling into the sea are groundless. The missiles carried by this type of submarine have "Nachinka" solid propellant engines so their fuel will burn both in the air and underwater. Any fuel scattered by the explosion would have burned up without a trace, and there is no reason to speak of any sort of damage to the environment.

A commission from Northern Fleet headquarters will investigate the cause of the incident.

Statement on Accident

LD0310115391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1055 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Anufriyev: "Official Announcement About the Submarine Accident"—TASS headline]

[Text] Arkhangelsk, 3 October (TASS)—Vice Admiral V. Poroshin, chairman of the interdepartmental commission investigating the accident involving the Northern Fleet submarine, issued the following statement for the press today:

On 27 September, a nuclear submarine of the Northern Fleet was carrying out combat training tasks that involved a training launch of a solid-fuel missile. The propulsion system functioned at the wrong time, the missile destroyed itself, and the missile's fuel—ordinary powder and missile fuel components—burned out. The fire was put out by the crew and there were no casualties among the submarine's crew. Inspection of the submarine and samples of air and water taken from the tube confirm that there are no harmful consequences whatsoever for the environment. The submarine's nuclear propulsion system is operative and was working under normal conditions. The design of the tubes ensures the complete security of the submarine's armaments and systems wherever accidents take place. An interdepartmental commission is investigating the incident.

Reporter Views Accident

LD0310040891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0130 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Report from Arkhangelsk by correspondent Valentin Bogomolov]

[Text] When I saw the article "A Hair's Breadth From Disaster" in the local newspaper PRAVDA SEVERA [NORTHERN TRUTH], I could not help contemplating what danger all of us had avoided; that is, the 400,000 in Arkhangelsk and 250,000 in Severodvinsk. According to the PRAVDA SEVERA report, on Friday evening, on one of the submarines of the Northern Fleet, a fire broke out in a missile tube. Firing was to have taken place from that submarine. The submarine was in the Barents Sea, approximately 60 km from Arkhangelsk, and considerably closer to Severodvinsk, near Iyoniks. It was carrying missiles with nuclear warheads.

Just imagine what could have happened. If there had been a nuclear explosion in the water, a tsunami, a wave of sea water, would have swamped 250,000-strong Severodvinsk and 400,000-strong Arkhangelsk. They are located on low-lying shore. If the explosion had occurred above water, it would have been a second Chernobyl.

The most terrible thing is not that there was a fire, but that there is a system of keeping quiet about the disaster which prevails over us, which dominates us. I tried to learn some details, but did not learn anything. Arkhangelsk's civil defense is keeping quiet. As for the nature conservation committee, I spoke with Deputy Chairman Nikolay Yakovlich Medvedev, and he only learned about the disaster from the newspaper. The military, as usual, did not wish to inform the civilian bodies. Medvedev even expressed doubt as to whether the oblast executive committee knows about the disaster at all.

That is how things stand. Two towns were almost destroyed by the military, but everything is purportedly calm. Chernobyl has taught us nothing. We have learned nothing at all.

Northern Fleet Crews Prepare Strike Action

LD0310172991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1548 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Vasily Belousov]

[Text] Murmansk, 3 Oct (TASS)—An event unheard of in the history of the USSR's Navy has taken place in the

Northern Fleet. An expanded conference of the crews of auxiliary vessels has created a strike committee and announced its intention to begin a strike.

"Our demands are just, and therefore legal," Valentin Andreyev, member of the strike committee, believes. "Volunteer sailors on auxiliary fleet vessels demand that privileges enjoyed by all inhabitants of the north be extended to them, and that their wages rise to the level received by our colleagues on the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet vessels. It is precisely the low wages and lack of housing which have led to the vessels of the auxiliary fleet having at present manning levels of only 66 percent. But we will resort to strike action only after we exhaust all other possibilities for solving the labor conflict."

The demands of the crews were recognized as just by deputy commander of the Northern Fleet in the rear, Rear Admiral Viktor Dobushev. "It really is the case that our volunteer sailors, just as, incidentally, workers in defense industries as well, are placed in an unequal situation with their colleagues in civil departments," he noted. "The command of the fleet would like to help but our hands are tied by departmental directives. So this conflict must be resolved in the USSR Ministry of Defense. Moreover, it must be resolved in the interests not only of the Northern Sea men but of all who work in our system. The earlier this is implemented the better for the defense capability of the country, because the fleet's fighting capability to a large degree depends on the crews of the auxiliary vessels."

A similiar point of view was also expressed in a conversation with a TASS correspondent by chief of the Navy's auxiliary fleet Vice Admiral Rudolf Paromov. In order to increase the wages of volunteer sailors, a government decision is necessary, he said. In the words of the vice admiral, the command of the Navy and the USSR Ministry of Defense have appealed to the country's president and government with the request to solve this issue. There is no reply as yet.

Conscription Decree Delay Causing 'Confusion'

PM0410102591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 91 p 1

[A. Krayniy report: "Mikhail Sergeyevich, Soldiers Due for Demobilization Are Expressing Concern"]

[Text] Yesterday the editorial offices received numerous telephone calls. They all raised the same question: Where is the USSR president's decree on discharge from the Army?

Businessmen say: In order to cover expenses, you must have income. But "so far there has been no income," in other words no conscription into the Soviet Army. A week has passed since the decree on the discharge of some and the induction of others, prepared in the Ministry of Defense, landed on the USSR president's desk—but alas!

Clearly, the Baltic states, Moldova, and Georgia will not hand over their draftees, but did the remaining republics not agree on unified Armed Forces? That was in August-September. It would appear that by October the republics' urge to set up their own armies had surmounted all other wishes. Obviously, the USSR president has not yet been able to influence his fellow presidents and has taken up a defensive position. Things cannot go on long in this way, otherwise cutbacks in the Army will reach tidal proportions, as with Bulat Shalvovich [allusion unknown]: "Take your greatcoat and go home."

Colonel General Mikhail Kolesnikov, chief of the General Staff Main Organization and Mobilization Directorate, told me that the draft commissions are ready for work, but until they have the legal basis—the president's decree—naturally, they cannot work.

"Unfortunately, I cannot say anything more definite," he added with a heavy sigh. "We can only hope."

Hope is a fine thing, of course, but there is great confusion among the troops. Even discord is not far away.

Gorbachev Issues Decree

LD0310220691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 3 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] We have just received the text of the USSR president's decree transferring to the reserves those servicemen who already have done their active military service and calling up citizens due for active military service in October to December of this year. Male citizens aged 18 by the day of their call-up, as well as those citizens over their conscription age who have lost their right to delayed call-up, are being drafted.

Gorbachev Decree on Servicemen's Affairs Committee

PM0310151591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Oct 91 Single Edition p 1

["USSR Presidential Decree on the Creation of a Committee for the Affairs of Servicemen and Members of Their Families Under the USSR President"—KRASNAYA ZVEZDA headline]

[Text] In view of numerous appeals by servicemen and members of their families and the proposals by the All-Union Council of Servicemen's Parents, taking into consideration the conclusions drawn by the special commission for examining the objectivity and completeness of investigations into the cause of peacetime death and injury among servicemen and military construction personnel, and taking into account the need to radically improve the social and legal protection of servicemen and members of their families and to guarantee effective monitoring of the situation in this sphere, I resolve:

1. To create a Committee for the Affairs of Servicemen and Members of Their Families under the USSR president.

2. To appoint Anatoliy Alekseyevich Alekseyev chairman of the Committee for the Affairs of Servicemen and Members of Their Families under the USSR president.

3. To task A.A. Alekseyev with submitting proposals on the composition of the committee and a draft statute for the said committee within one month.

[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev.
Moscow, The Kremlin, 26 September 1991

Defense Commission Announces Start of Reforms

92SV0002A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Sep 91 First Edition p 1

[Article by Captain 2d Rank V. Urban and Major A. Yegorov: "Military Reform Just Started in August—News Conference of the USSR Ministry of Defense Commission"]

[Text] A news conference was held on 25 September in the Russian House of Soviets by Colonel General D. Volkogonov, chairman of the commission on the abolition of military-political organs and the establishment of organs of combat training and structures for work with personnel in the USSR Armed Forces, and his deputies Colonel General E. Vorobyev and Colonel V. Lopatin.

If we were to pick out the main idea of the news conference, then it is expressed in these words: Military reform just started in August of this year with the departyization of the Armed Forces and the abolition of the military-political organs. That is, de-ideologization occurred. We do not think it was accidental that Colonel General D. Volkogonov said in his introductory remarks:

"Starting from October 1917, our country could be personified by two institutions: the ChK [Extraordinary Commission in the Fight Against Counterrevolutionaries and Sabotage] and commissariats. In fact, these elements of the Soviet system characterized that society which we are painfully and with difficulty reforming, and we are attempting to create a civilized democratic society."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA regularly explains how the commission is working. But what can be said about the fate of former political workers? As was heard at the news conference, one of the aims of the commission is not to forget the individual, and especially the younger officers, the majority of whom possess excellent military skills. Everyone who wishes can leave the Army and retrain for work in new structures, or transfer to command staff positions. Especially as the platoon-company echelon is short of personnel.

According to preliminary polls, only 17 percent of the former political workers agreed to a voluntary discharge, and 20 percent agreed to retrain. In any case, as D. Volkogonov said, to determine the fate of people is very difficult, but we have to decide all questions before 1 December.

Inasmuch as the majority of those present are military journalists, including managers of press publications, it was not accidental that the first questions were about the fate of military newspapers. A group on the reorganization of the mass media is working on the staff of the commission. Taking this opportunity, we inform military journalists that the contact telephone of the group in Moscow is 293-36-60. They await your proposals there.

But here is what V. Lopatin said in this regard:

"One thing is unquestionable today: The military press, like military science, should not play the role of a servant, it should not reflect that which some chiefs want, but that which is a fact. This principle will be put into practice."

In this connection, we did not fail to pose the question to the leadership of the commission about how they see the reform of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (our collective adopted draft regulations, according to which it will be a cofounder of the newspaper). Here is what D. Volkogonov said:

"The military newspaper, remaining a defense newspaper, must acquire an independent status."

Responding to questions concerning the fate of military-political schools, D. Volkogonov said that a poll of the cadets conducted by the commission showed the necessity of releasing (as early as December-January) a quarter of the cadets ahead of schedule, with the aim of determining their prospects. About 20 percent of the graduates expressed a desire to be discharged into the reserve immediately, and it is necessary to give them this opportunity. Approximately as many want to retrain for service in command positions. Given the 50,000 shortage, this can only be welcomed.

A majority of the graduates want to join the new structures, taking positions as specialists in combat training psychology support, information officers, social services officers, personnel officers, military sociologists, and specialists in legal work and in the area of professional selection and professional orientation. But special training is needed for this, for example, in courses, for which time has to be granted after graduating ahead of schedule. But the fate of the schools themselves is not absolutely clear, inasmuch as they are located on the territories of several sovereign republics (except for two in the Baltics that simply will be disbanded).

Will all of the graduates who desire to continue service in positions associated with educational work be appointed? No simple answer to this question was received. It is necessary to consider, said E. Vorobyev,

that the graduates of higher educational institutions are pouring into a stream of 92,500 former political workers without permanent assignments, among whom are a little less than 29,000 junior officers of the company echelon, and 8,800, of the battalion echelon.

At the conclusion of the news conference, the journalists were informed of the content of a memorandum sent by D. Volkogonov to the RSFSR president regarding the formation of a national guard of Russia. "I think that a mistake is being made now," said Dmitriy Antonovich. "I think that we do not have to create a national guard by means of enrollment... I would take one or two divisions, for example, airborne assault, perhaps two naval infantry regiments... It would be expedient to establish a Russian national guard on this basis... This is already a ready guard!.. It really would be professional." "When what comes to the fore is that Zaytsev will prepare a uniform and high salaries," D. Volkogonov said further, "this is...amateurish. We must not resolve important state questions in an amateurish way."

V. Lopatin expressed himself much more sharply on this question. Without a decision of the session of the Supreme Soviet of Russia, he called the existing procedure for recruitment into the guard illegal, which not only discredits the very idea of a national guard, but it also "seriously damages" President B. Yeltsin.

Deputy Defense Minister Rodionov Interviewed

PM0410100191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Oct 91 Single Edition p 2

[Interview with Lieutenant General Yu. Rodionov, USSR deputy defense minister for personnel and chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Main Personnel Directorate, by Lieutenant Colonel V. Silkin under the rubric "First Interview in New Post"; place and date not given: "Emphasizing Professionalism"]

[Text] As reported earlier, by decree of the country's president Lieutenant General Yu. Rodionov has been appointed USSR deputy defense minister for personnel and chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Main Personnel Directorate. Today Yuriy Nikolayevich replies to questions from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's editorial team.

[Silkin] Comrade Lieutenant General, great changes are under way in the Armed Forces and new people are being promoted to many posts. In the light of this, what are the paramount tasks facing you and the Main Personnel Directorate collective?

[Rodionov] Above all, talk must center on prospects for the work of personnel organs. You know, it is precisely the new people replacing those who have been discharged to the reserve or retired who will have to assimilate the ideas of the military reform and put them into practice. The reform is the chief thing now; there is no more important problem. The notorious August events graphically demonstrated the kind of attitude which must be adopted toward selecting and placing personnel to ensure that nothing extraordinary can happen... Care and scrupulousness in work are the fundamental factors.

We have a special responsibility for the fate of each person. This is particularly important now, when political organs are being disbanded. People used to take their problems to the political departments, but now they will come to the personnel departments and directorates. But are we all prepared for this?

We must also give thought to raising officers' general culture and seeking to ensure that this not just a heroic profession but also an intellectual one. The situation is still poor regarding education in the Army.

[Silkin] Does this mean that there will be some special new demands on personnel organs regarding work with officers?

[Rodionov] Every personnel organ—from the lowest component to the Main Personnel Directorate—must be a team of like-minded thinkers and professionals in their field. We have had enough of nonspecialists doing any old thing any old how. Nothing must contravene the law.

[Silkin] This can only be welcomed. But what, Yuriy Nikolayevich, is in store for those already serving in the forces? For example, can you tell us the essential point of the defense minister's recent directive on work with military personnel?

[Rodionov] The directive is intended to regulate the service of officers. This is linked primarily with the need to profoundly reform and reduce the USSR Armed Forces and to depoliticize and departyize the Army and Navy and with fundamentally new approaches to work with military personnel on the basis of strict observance of legality and each serviceman's constitutional rights and obligations...

[Silkin] Does it follow from the directive that all generals and officers who have completed prescribed terms of service will soon be discharged?

[Rodionov] While emphasizing professionalism, it is necessary to ensure the planned rotation of officer personnel. The discharge of officers who have reached the age limits and earned the right to a Defense Ministry pension should become a natural, fully conscious fact marking the end of conscientious service to defend the homeland.

[Silkin] Will there be exceptions for, say, military doctors, lecturers, scientists, or journalists?

[Rodionov] The approach to these categories will be strictly individual.

[Silkin] By what criteria will commanders and personnel organs be guided in this process?

[Rodionov] An instrument exists, of course—it is the efficiency report. But many aspects of the efficiency

report mechanism and the approach toward evaluating the personal and professional qualities of officers are obsolete today and require review. So draft new guidance on efficiency reports on USSR Armed Forces officers has been prepared. It has already been discussed in the Defense Ministry Collegium. Army and Navy leaders noted that the existing efficiency report procedure takes the form of a crash campaign and consequently tends to be just a formality. The simultaneous completion of efficiency reports for Army and Navy officer personnel gives no opportunity for profound and comprehensive appraisal of each officer, general, and admiral and puts them on unequal terms, as they are appraised irrespective of time in post but from the same standpoint. It must be stressed that the frequency of efficiency reports (once every four years) does not make it possible to use its results to create a sufficient personnel reserve for the period between efficiency reports. The lack of annual evaluations of the activities of officers also has an extremely negative impact. So it is proposed to take time in post into account in preparing efficiency reports for various categories of officers. It will be necessary to make the process open to exclude cases of subjective evaluations of officers, generals, and admirals. The Defense Ministry leadership has adopted a firm course of democratization and of reinforcing the social protection of servicemen. The officer is a key figure in the Army. He is the principal bearer of high professionalism and high human morality in Army and Navy collectives. He above all must be surrounded with care and attention.

Take, for example, one of the most severe problems—housing. There is no doubt that providing apartments for officers will at long last spare them from a number of vital problems and allow them to devote all their efforts and knowledge to resolving combat training tasks to high standards. But this problem cannot be resolved through the efforts of the Defense Ministry alone. organs of power at local level must also take part in this.

There is something else which is no secret to anybody. Lieutenants' families often break up because of elementary domestic disruption after graduates from military schools and their combat helpmates run up against the first of life's ups-and-downs. The young wives, the overwhelming majority of whom have higher and secondary specialized education, cannot find work in their specialties and go back to their parents. One of the reasons for their departure is the impossibility of leading a normal material existence. So the increase in salary and per diem rates for servicemen on tours of duty and the acquisition by officers of the right to buy foodstuffs at state prices through the military commissary is timely and important.

The 28 August order by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin is filled with state concern for reinforcing servicemen's social protection. I do not rule out the possibility that the Russian president's example will be followed by the heads of other republics on whose territory military units are stationed.

[Silkin] Many officers serve in areas with difficult and unfavorable climatic conditions, but nevertheless no corresponding benefits are laid down. What is the outlook here?

[Rodionov] The command of branches of the USSR Armed Services, military districts, and USSR Defense Ministry main and central directorates has presented many proposals to extend the lists of areas with difficult and unfavorable climatic conditions in the RSFSR, the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Central Asian republics envisaging five- and 10-year periods of continuous service for servicemen, regular 45-day leave, reserved housing at their place of permanent residence, and the preferential calculation of service years for pension purposes. The proposals have been analyzed, summarized, and prepared so that this question can be presented for resolution.

[Silkin] One final question, Yuriy Nikolayevich. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduced you to its readers a few days ago. The report stated when and where you were born and what posts you have served in... Nevertheless, I would like to learn a little more about you—who your parents were and what your hobbies are...

[Rodionov] My father was a grain storage and processing specialist. He died in 1942 at the front. My mother was a paramedic by trade. Now she lives in Taganrog: She is a pensioner. As for hobbies, I love jazz music and I have collected records for many years. I have built up a big record library. I try to read a lot. I particularly like the works of our great compatriot Anton Pavlovich Chekhov. Although "How To Be a Millionaire" by S. Leacock is currently on my bedside table. By dint of my official position I could rent a state dacha. But I have a garden plot (0.06 hectares) in the Moscow suburbs. I am building a small house there myself in my spare time: When I was a child I learned various crafts while helping the grown-ups. And as for my free time—I simply have nowhere near enough of it...

Career of New Moscow Air Defense Chief Outlined

PM0310114791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Sep 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "New Appointments"]

[Text] We present Lieutenant General of Aviation Anatoliy Mikhaylovich Kornukov, the new commander of the Moscow Air Defense District.

He was born on 10 January 1942 in the town of Stakhanov, Lugansk Oblast. He graduated from Chernigov Higher Military Pilots College in 1964. He began his career with the Air Defense Forces as a senior pilot.

He became commander of a fighter air regiment in 1974. After graduating from the G.K. Zhukov Air Defense Military Academy in 1980 he commanded a fighter air division and then a fighter air corps.

He graduated from the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy in 1988. He was successively first deputy commander of Air Defense Forces fighter aircraft, first deputy commander of an Air Defense Forces large strategic formation, and—since 1989—commander of an Air Defense Forces large strategic formation.

Military Stockpiles of Food for Winter Viewed

PM0310155391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Oct 91 Single Edition p 2

[Colonel F. Semyanovskiy report: "Preparing for Winter"]

[Text] Procurement of potatoes and fruit and vegetable produce for military units, military educational institutions, and Armed Forces organizations and establishments is in full swing. Thus, in Kiev Military District 29,800 tonnes of potatoes and 8,100 tonnes of vegetables have already been stored. In the North Caucasus Military District, 20,000 tonnes of potatoes and 4,000 tonnes of vegetables have been taken from the fields.

Things are progressing according to plan in Moscow Military District (56,400 tonnes of potatoes and 14,600 tonnes of vegetables) and in the Volga Region-Urals Military District (39,800 tonnes of potatoes and 10,700 tonnes of vegetables).

An alarming situation persists for naval sailors. Thus, a total of 4,900 tonnes of vegetables is available to the Pacific Ocean Fleet so far. The Baltic Fleet has access to even less produce—in all, 2,500 tonnes of potatoes and 600 tonnes of vegetables.

Summary of Military Help With Harvest

PM0310154791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Oct 91 Single Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Summary of Operations"—All figures as published]

[Text] We hereby publish a summary of operations on progress in gathering the harvest as of 30 September obtained from the USSR Ministry of Defense Motor Transport Battalion Leadership Headquarters.

A total of 80 motor transport battalions were involved in the work (40,000 vehicles).

RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]—68 battalions (34,000 vehicles).

Kazakhstan—12 battalions (6,000 vehicles).

The total volume of agricultural freight transported reads as follows: 13.8 million tonnes, including 4.705 million tonnes of grain.

RSFSR—12.599 million tonnes, including 4.079 million tonnes of grain.

Kazakhstan—1.271 million tonnes, including 626,000 tonnes of grain.

The number of vehicles standing idle totaled 6,294. These included 4,594 vehicles in the RSFSR, and 1,700 vehicles in Kazakhstan.

Estonia

Savisaar, Shaposhnikov Discuss Soviet Troops

OW0310213391 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2010 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Minister of Defense of the USSR Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov and Estonia's Premier Edgar Savisaar held a meeting at the Defense Ministry in Moscow on October 3. The status of Soviet armed forces in Estonia was one of the issues discussed.

Reach Agreement on Troop Pullout

OW0410124991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1100 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Estonia's Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar and the USSR Defense Minister Yevgeny Shaposhnikov agreed in principle in Moscow on Thursday that the Soviet troops vould be withdrawn from Estonian territory.

The agreement is the first official document whereby the Soviet Union pledges to pull its troops out of a Baltic republic.

The parties wrote down that the time limits for the Soviet pullout would be set by an intergovernmental treaty between the two countries, and the order of the troop withdrawal by separate protocols.

The Estonian Minister of State Raivo Vare told BF [BALTFAX] that E. Savisaar and Y. Shaposhnikov had also agreed orally that the military withdrawal would begin without delay. Specifically, two battalions of assault troops would leave Estonia within the next month.

Under the agreement, Estonia will regain the land currently occupied by Soviet Army units. Until they leave for home, Soviet troops will be paying land rent to Estonia.

The agreement says the USSR Defense Ministry will consider the opportunities for transferring to the Estonian government on mutually acceptable terms certain amounts of weapons, ammunition and military hardware.

Mr. Vare noted that the army command displayed what he called "the Karabakhi syndrom" in formulating with "double care" the provision on the transfer of weapons to the Estonian side.

The parties agreed to set up a joint commission to define the status of the Soviet contingent temporarily staying on Estonian territory, and to vork out suggestions concerning the time limits and order of the troop withdrawal. No additional forces will be sent to Estonia, and no new military bases will be set up on its territory. The strength of the military contingent will not exceed that of Setember 1 1991.

Soviet Army units have been ordered not to block on the territories they control the fulfillment of duties by the police, customs service, border guards, or other government services in Estonia.

During the period until an intergovernmental treaty is signed, the USSR Defense Ministry will "substantially restrict" the holding of field and shooting exercises on Estonian territory. Each such operation will be coordinated with the republican government.

The government of Estonia, for its part, undertakes to guarantee the observance of the social and civil rights of army servicemen and their families on Estonian territory.

R. Vare said Thursday's talks had revealed a number of differences between the negotiating parties, and the agreement signed was a "matter of compromise." For instance, the date of the beginning of the Soviet troop withdrawal was crossed out from the text. Although we did not discuss any time limits for the Soviet pullout, I believe the bulk of the Soviet contingent can be withdrawn from Estonia during the next 12 months, R. Vare observed.

Asked whether the Soviet Defense Ministry would receive any compensation for the fixed assets it was leaving to Estonia, Mr. Vare said one of the possible neasures might be to sell ex-military installations on Estonia's market of immovable property and offer the proceeds (with the deduced interest) to departing army servicemen in the form of bonuses.

Plans To Issue Identity Document Noted

LD0410045291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1150 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn, 3 Oct (TASS)—An identity document issued by the Estonian state bodies should be considered proof of Estonian citizenship. The government of the republic has proposed this to the presidium of the Supreme Soviet.

Such a proposal would not have stepped outside the framework of the process of building a state in Estonia, which has just acquired independence, if it was not for the fact that the idea of citizenship does not exist at all.

The concept of the basis for granting citizenship has been debated in the society and in the parliament for some time. Law-makers have failed to find a variant that satisfies, if not all groups of the population, then at least the majority.

The Estonian committee in favor of restoring the republic on the basis of the pre-war independent Estonian state has already prepared and started issuing its own identity document for citizens. They are being handed out only to those who had Estonian citizenship up to 16 June 1940 and their direct descendants.

If the presidium of the Supreme Soviet approves the proposal to begin issuing its own indentity document, then it will have to give a principle assessment of the actions of the Estonian committee as a public formation that has taken on the function of a state body.

Estonian Minister of Justice Yuri Raidla thinks that not only the presidium but the whole of the Supreme Soviet should give their assessment of the initiative of the government as well as of the Estonian committee. As a minister, he is inclined to believe that only after the final resolution of the issues connected with the institute of citizenship in Estonia can an identity document as proof of citizenship be issued. Yury Rayda admitted that he had discussed with representatives of the Estonian committee issues of changing the status of the indentity document that is being issued by the committee. In connection with this, he emphasized that the form of the identity document has not been examined by the government and that it does not confirm with European standards, which demand the existence of 32 empty pages for exit and entry visas.

Regarding the restoration of the legal validity of Estonian passports for foreign travel, in the opinion of the minister, one should leave this matter for a future date. Necessary consultations should be carried out abroad to avoid legal collisions in the future.

Officials Comment on Nascent Intelligence Service

OW0410003391 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1520 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Discussions are continuing in Estonia on the forming of the Investigation Bureau, the intelligence service of the Estonian Republic.

The Bureau was set up by decree of Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar on September 8 as a branch of the Special Service within the Estonian police. The Special Service provides security for key statesmen and government buildings and comes under the authority of the republic's Interior Minister. But the minister himself, Olev Laanjarv, was not informed that the Bureau had been formed.

A BF [BALTFAX] correspondent reports from Tallinn that the Estonian government will reply to deputies' inquiries about the creation of the Bureau in Parliament on October 8.

Mr Laanjarv said in an interview granted to the Paevaleht newspaper that he did not see any reasons why the Bureau should be part of the Special Service and believed it should be removed from the police system. The Bureau, he thought, should be placed under the control of the Defence Council.

In an interview given to the same paper, the Estonian Minister of Justice, Juri Raidla, said he had also learnt about the formation of the Bureau from the press. Estonia did need a secret service, he thought, but its activity should be based on the law on the security of Estonia.

Decree Restricts Use of Strategic Reserves

OW0410003291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1520 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In an interview given to the Rahva Haal newspaper, Estonia's Minister of Material Resources, Aleksandr Sikkal, said that the Estonian government had issued a decree in accordance with which no use could be made of the republic's strategic reserves without a permission from the government.

Thereby Estonia has begun to implement the decision taken by the Baltic Council at its last week's session in accordance with which the portion of the state reserves of the USSR kept on the territory of the Baltic states will be transferred to the latter's jurisdiction.

Latvia

Yakovlev, Moscow Delegate Hold Preliminary Talks

LD0410022991 Moscow TASS in Engli 1354 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—The first meeting of the leaders of the state delegations of the USSR and Latvia is to be held here today, Janis Peters, permanent representative of the Latvian Republic, told TASS. He said the meeting would be unofficial.

The Soviet delegation for talks, aimed at resolving a package of issues connected with the recognition of Latvia by the Soviet Union, is led by Academician Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Political Consultative Council to the president of the USSR. The Latvian delegation is led by Janis Dinjevic, a deputy to the Latvian parliament.

Delegations for talks with the three Baltic republics were appointed way back in February. However, their competence was limited to "the discussion of a package of political, social and economic issues" with representatives of these republics that had proclaimed their independence.

Following the recognition of the Baltic states by the Soviet Union, President Mikhail Gorbachev appointed prominent leaders of the democratic movement—Aleksandr Yakovlev, Eduard Shevardnadze and Anatoliy Sobchak—to lead delegations for the talks.

In the coming days they are to submit proposals on the composition of the delegations, a negotiating procedure, and subjects for the talks.

Discuss Economic Issues, Troops

OW0310213291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2010 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia's permanent mission in Moscow was the venue on October 3 of a tete-a-tete meeting between the heads of the delegations at Soviet-Latvian talks, namely beteen Mr. Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Political Advisory Council of the president of the USSR, and Mr Janis Dinevich, leader of the Popular Front group in Latvia's parliament.

Mr. Dinevich told a "BALTFAX" correspondent that this had been a preliminary meeting of the two heads of delegations "aimed at getting acquainted with each other". He also said they had been pinpointing the items that will come up at future discussions. According to Mr. Dinevich, these will be primarily economic matters, as well as the issue of withdrawing Soviet troops from Latvia. According to information received by our correspondent from the permanent representative of Latvia in Moscow, Mr. Janis Peters, it is the intention of Latvia to press for Soviet Armed Forces to be pulled out at the earliest possible time, while their status in the meantime should be defined as temporary.

Identify Future Bilateral Agenda

LD0310215791 Moscow TASS in English 2034 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—The first meeting of heads of state delegations from the Soviet Union and Latvia was held at the permanent mission of Latvia in Moscow today.

Head of the Latvian delegation Janis Dinevic told TASS over the phone that the meeting, that lasted for almost 90 minutes, was of preliminary and non-official character.

In the words of Dinevic, his conversation with Soviet delegation head Academician Aleksander Yakovlev outlined a range of issues to be discussed during the future bilateral negotiations.

Yakovlev told correspondents upon the completion of the meeting that the major aim of it was "an acquaintance" with negotiations partner.

Godmanis Reaffirms Economic Linkage Intention

OW0310213491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2010 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a press-conference in Riga on October 3, Latvia's Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis told reporters about the results of the meeting of the leaders of 13 former Soviet republics in Alma-Ata on October 1. It should be noted that in the absence of Estonian and Lithuanian leaders, Mr Godmanis was the only representative from the Baltics. In the expression of Mr Godmanis, "it was the fear of the consequences of a complete disintegration that brought all of us together". Latvia's Premier confirmed that his country intends to become an associate member of the common market and economic area that will bring together former Soviet republics. He also said that "Latvia will not remain in the rouble area".

According to a "BALTFAX" correspondent, the Baltic Council will be meeting on October 5-6 in Vilnius to discuss future economic links between the Baltics and the republics of what used to be the USSR.

Rejects Economic 'Union'

LD0310234891 Riga Radio Riga International in English 2130 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis has announced that the Republic of Latvia will not take part in any sort of economic union with the former Soviet republics and that economic relations with republics will be based on mutual treaties.

In his report on his participation in the recent economic consultations with the 13 republics in Kazakhstan, the prime minister said, however, that he is a proponent of Latvian associated membership in the economic unions of both Europe and the former USSR territories. These relationships will be necessary, Mr. Godmanis said, if Latvia wishes to completely function as an economic bridge between the West and the East.

The prime minister also added that the situation in the East is apparently too unclear to finalize these plans.

USSR Parliamentary Representation Ceases

LD0310183991 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga October 3 TASS—The Latvian parliament decided to cease as of today the Latvian Republic's parliamentary representation in the Soviet Union.

A resolution passed by parliament halts any "territorial or other representation of residents of the Latvian Republic in any parliamentary bodies of a state or a union of states, that are successors to the old Soviet Union, following the fifth extraordinary Congress of USSR Peoples Deputies." Exclusively the bodies of the Latvian Foreign Ministry are now empowered to represent the Latvian Republic in its relations with the former Soviet Union.

Mutual Trade Issues Discussed With Moldova

OW0410003191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1520 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Leaders from Latvia and Moldova are holding a meeting in Riga today to discuss questions of mutual trade in 1992. Latvia proposes to export the folloing to Moldova: tools, consumer goods, radioelectronics, wood panels, fabrics, clothes, agricultural products, fish, building materials, compressors and electrical equipment. Moldova will export products made from metal, clothes, consumer goods and such agricultural products as vegetables, wine and butter.

Supreme Council Debates Citizenship Question

LD0410023491 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga October 3 TASS—After the restoration of state independence in the Latvian Republic, the question of who will be eligible for citizenship of the new Latvia is being intensively debated. The Supreme Council has not yet adopted a law on citizenship. But some radical organisations believe the issue should only be decided by the Sejm which is yet to be reinstated.

Janis Dinevic, leader of the Popular Front parliamentary group, said the matter of citizenship should be decided by the current Supreme Council, as is the opinion of most members of his group.

Dinevic believes the rights of those who were citizens of the Latvian Republic before June 1940 and their descendants can be instantly restored. Preliminary estimates show half the number of the republic's permanent residents to be in this category.

The legal status of the other part of the Latvian population will apparently be decided after parliament discusses the draft constitutional law on human and citizen's rights and a draft law on citizenship. These documents will be submitted to a plenary session of the Latvian Supreme Council on October 8. By all indications, there are different views on the problem of citizenship, and the debate will be prolonged and acute.

A small group of deputies who quit the opposition group "Equality" has presented its own draft declaration which proclaims anybody who was permanently residing in Latvia as of August 21, 1991 to be citizen of the Latvian Republic.

The citizenship debate will be a political rather than juridical dispute. As Deputy Aleksandr Kirshtein said, "the destiny of one million settlers and members of their families is to be decided." He describes as settlers people of other nationalities who arrived in Latvia since 1940. Not sharing such attitudes Dinevic said "the Latvian Republic will be responsible for all permanent residents of the republic without question on citizenship."

Volunteer People's Front Detachments Dissolved

OW0310234091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1610 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Latvian government decided yesterday to dissolve the volunteer detachments formed by the People's Front of Latvia at the end of 1989 to maintain order during rallies and other mass-scale public events. Their members were not allowed to bear arms.

Now the Public Security Department of Latvia has been instructed to include the commanders of the detachments in its staff and take over their funds.

A BF [BALTFAX] correspondent reports that the decision has been prompted by the government's desire to put maintenance of law and order on a professional basis.

Defense Ministry To Be Formed by 1 Nov

OW0310213691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2010 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia's parliament has instructed the republic's government to form the Defense Ministry of the republic by November 1 this year. A Statute on Border Guards should be presented for approval to the presidium of the republic's Supreme Council by the same date. The Council of Ministers has been charged with approving the design of a uniform for border guards, while the border guard manual is to be drawn up by the Department of Public Security by November 1.

Protestors Demand Rubik's Release

OW0410125791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1100 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] About 50 people came on Thursday evening to Latvia's permanent mission in Moscow to demand the release from detention of Alfreds Rubiks, ex-leader of the Latvian Communist party who had been arrested on charges of cooperation with the putschists after the failed coup d'etat in August.

After five activists met with Latvia's permanent representative Janis Peters who promised to reply to their demand during the next few days, the protesters went home.

Foreign Exchange Reserves Total $3.4 Million

OW0310213591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2010 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As of September 15, 1991, the foreign exchange reserves of Latvia's government amounted to US$3.4m. This information was made public in Riga by deputy director general of the Department for External Economic Ties, Mr Juris Kanels, who quoted sources in his department.

Lithuania

Supreme Council Moves To Reorganize Government

OW0410130091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1100 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Supreme Council in Lithuania has decided to reorganize the republic's government.

There will be a number of new ministries, among them the National Defense Ministry, the Ministry of Communications and Informatics [as recieved], and the Ministry of International Economic Relations.

The Trade Ministry and the Ministry of Telecommunications have been scrapped. The Ministry of Material Resources has been renamed the Ministry of Trade and Material Resources.

The Lithuanian parliament has also passed laws defining the status of foreign diplomatic missions in Lithuania and the status of Lithuanian diplomatic missions abroad. This package of "diplomatic" laws is based on the universally accepted legal norms and Principles.

Legislator Views Problems in Talks With USSR

LD0310220291 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius October 3 TASS—"Although the Soviet Union recognised the Lithuanian Republic, it has not yet begun withdrawing its troops from the Lithuanian territory. Such circumstances can hardly be regarded as favourable for inter-state talks," Cheslovas Stankjavicus, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Parliament, said at a briefing for journalists here today.

He said the Lithuanian state delegation, which will conduct talks with the USSR, met on Wednesday to discuss "problems in relations between the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union" and the conditions for these talks.

Stankjavicus expressed the view that the Soviet Union should begin moving its troops out of the republican territory before talks begin. He recalled Lithuania's stance that "the withdrawal of the army cannot be the subject of talks. Only consultations on the terms and procedure for the withdrawal are permissible, but these terms should be very short."

Negotiating Team Unchanged

OW0310234291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1610 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The composition of the Lithuanian delegation at the negotiations with the Soviet Union formed a year ago will remain unchanged. It will still be led by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Parliament. This was stated by Mr Landsberis' deputy, Ceslovas Stankevicius, at a briefing in Vilnius today. Mr Stankevicius again emphasized that "the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania cannot be a subject for negotiations" but is a firm demand of the republic's authorities.

Vilnius Seeks City Boundary Expansion

PM0410082591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 91 Single Edition p 1

[Untitled report from PRAVDA, TASS, INTERFAX roundup]

[Text] The Vilnius City Soviet has decided to expand the boundaries of the Lithuanian Republic's capital. A request has been sent to the republic Supreme Soviet to approve the city's new boundaries, incorporating part of Vilnyusskiy and Trakayskiy Rayons, the cities of Nemencine and Lentvaris, and the settlement of Grigiskes. The decisions will certainly meet with the disapproval of some Lithuanian Poles who believe that most of the aforementioned population centers should be part of a Polish national-territorial region.

Privatization Campaign Progress Reported

OW0410130191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1100 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to BALTFAX's Vilnius correspondent, since the privatization campaign began in Lithuania one month ago, 118 small- sized enterprises worth a total of 22 million rubles have been transferred into private hands in the republic.

22 enterprises have been reformed into shareholding companies.

In October, a total of 328 enterprises worth 1-odd billion rubles are expected to be privatized in Lithuania.

At present, Lithuanian citizens's investments in savings banks are estimated at 20 billion rubles.

Supreme Soviet

More on Burbulis Remarks at Fourth Session

PM0310113691 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Oct 91 p 1

[Report by parliamentary correspondent Robert Minasov from the White House: "Deputies 'Bypass' Isakov and Vow to Deal With the Matter—Fourth Session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet"]

[Excerpt] Meetings between presidential administration officials and the Russian deputies' body on all subjects are becoming traditional and, it seems, mutually beneficial. Nothing brings people together like a joint quest for truth.

Yesterday, State Secretary Gennadiy Burbulis addressed the assembled people's deputies and shared his views on those problems which concern the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president and his team in the present situation.

The secretary of state stressed that the deputies' body is most concerned by the following problem: On whose behalf and in what capacity will Russia participate in the economic agreement? This is not an idle question if you bear in mind that many republics have declared their independence. Does this mean independence from Russia?

A paradoxical situation is emerging. Many former republics intend to introduce their own currency, erect customs barriers, limit the export of their own produce across republic borders, and—finally—declare their ownership of everything located on their territory. And at the same time they are laying claim to a share of everything which is located on Russian territory.... Where is the justice here? Russia is in an ambiguous situation. And then there is the even greater problem of the Russian-speaking population living outside Russia's borders.

The second point of concern, the secretary of state noted, is the strengthening of executive authority. We face a choice, he declared: We either suspend the appointment of administration heads in the krays and oblasts, or postpone the 24 November elections, as was decided at separate sessions of the two RSFSR Supreme Soviet chambers. In my view we should refrain from holding elections, Gennadiy Burbulis said.

The secretary of state informed deputies that the task of forming a group of monitors from the Russian Parliament to implement the joint communique adopted in Zheleznovodsk on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast is almost complete, and he reported that another group is working successfully in Moldova.

Gennadiy Burbulis said that a very complex situation is emerging over the Union Treaty. The version which would have been signed if not for the putschists is absolutely unacceptable today. The center's participation in it is problematical. After all, it will be a state above other states.

In short, there is much to think about. Today, the secretary of state flies out to see the RSFSR president in order, he said, to spend two or three days working with him.

Gennadiy Burbulis announced that part of the apparatus of the republic president and Council of Ministers is preparing to move to Staraya Ploshchad. [passage omitted]

Federation Affairs

Yeltsin Visited by Burbulis, Saburov in Sochi

OW0310182191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1645 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Well-informed sources say Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] State Secretary Gennadiy Burbulis and Economy Minister Yevgeniy Saburov are visiting President Boris Yeltsin in Sochi, where he is having a rest. Their goal is to discuss with Mr. Yeltsin the opportunities for siging an interrepublican economic agreement on October 8, and analyze the situation in Russia's executive bodies.

Next Tuesday the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is expected to hold a plenary meeting at which President Yeltsin will report on the present situation within the executive structures in the Russian Federation.

Yeltsin Used Catholic Transmitter During Coup

AU0310172491 Paris AFP in English 1702 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] Vatican City, Oct 3 (AFP)—Russian President Boris Yeltsin used a radio transmitter provided by a Roman Catholic organization to communicate to his supporters while holed up in the Russian parliament building during August's abortive coup in Moscow, the organization revealed here Thursday.

Aid to the Suffering Church, which funds Radio Blagovest, said it smuggled radio equipment hidden in trucks of food into the parliament on August 19. Army troops were besieging the building at the time.

Viktor Aksjutscits, an MP [Member of Parliament] and friend of the station's administrative officer Jose Correa, organized the operation and air force pilots loyal to Yeltsin helped establish a link between the transmitter and an antenna at Moscow airport so Yeltsin could make a radio address to the people of Moscow. Yeltsin galvanized resistance to the hardline attempt to oust Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, which collapsed on August 21.

Radio Blagovest, which means Radio Good News in Russian, has since received permission to broadcast legally in the Soviet Union. Aid to the Suffering Church, in existence since 1947, is recognized by the Vatican as a bona fide international Catholic organization.

Council of Ministers Examines Economic Treaty

LD0310220191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2100 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] In its 2 October decision, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers declared that the government of Russia had not authorized anyone to conduct any talks or consultations with representatives of sovereign states. Proceeding from the sociopolitical situation, and after examining the draft treaty on an economic community, the Council of Ministers resolved to entrust Saburov, Kamenev, Maley, Fedorov, Lazarev and Shokhin with submitting, within one week, a conception of a political union of sovereign states and a treaty on an economic community, to hold consultations with sovereign states and to submit their proposals before 15 October.

It was also decided, before the appointment of a chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, to grant the right of signing the treaty on an economic community on behalf of the RSFSR government to Lobov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Khasbulatov Says Burbulis, Shakhray Should Resign

OW0310161791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Ruslan Khasbulatov maintains that Gennadiy Burbulis and Sergey Shakhray should resign because of failure to cope with their official duties. He told a Moscow news conference on Thursday that it is RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Secretary Burbulis and the RSFSR president's legal adviser Shakhray who are to blame for the fact that many of President Yeltsin's decrees are juridically inaccurate.

Mr. Khasbulatov said there are no contradictions between Russia's president and the parliament.

According to him, two referendums should be held to prevent the Ruussian Federation's break-up. One should be held among the autonomous entities, the other among the entire population of the republic. Mr. Khasbulatov cited the economists as saying that none of the autonomous or Union republics could possibly preserve independence without having the Russian Federation as an ally.

The future union will most likely be a confederation, with the Union president retaining a fixed number of matters under control, R. Khasbulatov said. He called for the country's nuclear arsenals to be concentrated in the Russian Federation, and added that the Ukraine, Kazakhstan and other republics had been invited to either transfer their nuclear arms to Russia or else destroy them altogether. According to Khasbulatov, it would be tremendously impotant from the political viewpoint to hear what the two presidents, Gorbachev and Yeltsin, think on the subject.

Deputies Support Rutskoy for Prime Minister

LD0410083291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0700 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Text] A correspondent of the Russian Information Agency has learned from well-informed sources that representatives of the deputies' faction of Democratic Russia have proposed that Aleksandr Rutskoy, the republic's vice president, occupy the vacant post of prime minister of Russia. According to information at hand, Rutskoy has reacted approvingly to this idea and has promised to introduce order.

Rutskoy Explains DPCR's Emergence, Aims, Tasks

PM0310125591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Oct 91 pp 1-2

[Report on interview with A. Rustkoy, chairman of the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia Council, by Mikhail Tarasov; place and date not given: "Democratic Party of Communists of Russia: Defending Not Against the Market But With the Market's Assistance"]

[Text] The CPSU has lost its monopoly on political power. A multiparty system is taking shape. But this process has still only begun. Ahead lies a struggle for a place in the sun—for political influence, for the name of parliamentary parties.

The DPCR—the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia—is one of many whose fate depends on whose interests it will defend and how. We asked Aleksandr Rutskoy, chairman of the DPCR Council, to tell readers about its emergence and the party's aims and tasks.

The DPCR arose quite recently but it already has a history rich in events. The point of departure in its establishment should be considered to be the creation of the "Communists for Democracy" parliamentary faction at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

At the time none of us was even thinking of an independent party. There was a specific task—opposing the senseless, unconstructive, dead-end policy of the "Communists of Russia" group. We watched with horror as with every step and every action the deputies who were members of this group compromised the title of communist, already quite tattered.

We felt a keen need to bring a simple thought to everyone: Communists are not all like that. In the party there are many sensible and sober people ready to promote society's renewal.

But the emergence of our group met with a hostile reception from the RCP [Russian Communist Party]. And I think that our initiative would not have been properly developed had we not very rapidly felt how timely it was. It turned out that many rank and file communists were very eager for their interests and their secret thoughts (and they were secret against their will: In the depths of the countryside, where the power of the party apparatus is omnipotent, a democratic stance, especially for communists, is far from safe) to finally be expressed by parliamentarians.

A barrage of letters, telephone calls, and telegrams of support descended on us, voicing the hope that perhaps something could still be done with the party, that perhaps it would stop delaying reforms.

These expectations did not suit the party apparatus. Our supporters began to be persecuted and deputies who had created similar groups in local soviets, not to mention rank and file communists, began to be the target of attacks by the party committees. Romantic hopes of cooperation with official structures and of the gradual reformation of the Communist Party from within began to be dispelled rapidly.

Time passed and, having become conclusively convinced of the futility of these hopes, we came to think that we needed our own association. We had to try to rally the forces of democratically minded communists and oppose, not only in parliament but also in the party organizations, those who try to use the party to drag our society backward.

And on 2-3 August the constituent conference of the DPCR, which was of an initiative nature, gathered in Moscow. Naturally, we could not accept people in massive numbers into a nonexistent party, although by the time the conference opened there were already about 10,000 applications. Representatives of organizational committees created locally, people elected by delegates in the party organizations, came to the conference. There were also those whom no one had elected, who, having read about the conference in the newspapers, set off for Moscow to speak, to support this undertaking by their presence.

But the conference had not had time to end before the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat had already published a statement declaring it incompetent and all decisions taken at it invalid. From the timing of the statement's appearance it was clear that its authors could not even have read the documents adopted at the conference, let alone have analyzed them. And on 6 August an RCP Central Committee plenum was held at which Lipitskiy and I were expelled from the CPSU for activity, as they said, "aimed at splitting the party."

And so the CPSU has rejected us. Everything would seem to be clear. But even at that moment we decided not to hurry the definitive break. It is hard to imagine how events would have developed had it not been for the putsch. It definitively compromised the CPSU.

On 19 August during the very first hours after the proclamation of the documents of the committee for the state of emergency, members of the DPCR Council in Moscow gathered in the White House. We adopted an appeal to the country's communists in which we described what was happening as a military-bureaucratic coup. We stated our complete rejection of the actions of the impostors and demanded that the CPSU Central Committee immediately give an assessment of the position of the leaders of the State Committee for the State of Emergency, who were at the same time members of top party organs.

A day went by. The position taken by the CPSU Central Committee no longer gave rise to any doubts and on the 20th—this happened while we were expecting to be stormed—we adopted a second document. In the document on behalf of the board we stated that the DPCR was joining the ranks of the opposition to the putsch and was breaking completely and definitively with the CPSU.

The party is now at the stage of being established. The RCP's activity, as is well known, has been suspended and the CPSU official structures do not operate on Russian territory. The mass movement of communists into our ranks has begun. We are receiving reports from rayon and city organizations and large primary organizations that they have adopted collective decisions to join the DPCR.

It would probably cost us nothing now to gather together a party of many millions within just a few days—we would only have to give the signal. But after all we must place barriers on the path of those who want to use the DPCR now simply to set themselves up in a changing life. That is why we insist firmly on the following: Admission to the DPCR can only be on an individual basis.

We recommend to our supporters locally that they rely primarily on those who stated their position prior to 19-21 August, those whom they already know as reliable supporters of the democratic course. It was they who created DPCR organizational committees and initiative groups locally. It is they who at the first stage have the right to decide the question of the formation of primary organizations, of admission to the party, and it is obviously they who should head the new local organizations.

The DPCR organizations are formed along territorial, professional, and functional lines. The party clubs should be their main base and cells locally. These should not be strictly political associations but places where people will have an opportunity to talk, to elaborate joint positions, and finally to spend their leisure hours. And all this should serve one purpose: preparing for elections. Incidentally, we are introducing in the statutes the institution of supporters, of those who voluntarily support the party without joining it.

The party's most important task is to find and promote leaders who can obtain the support fo the population at

the elections. An image must be created for these leaders and their election campaign must be waged and later, if they are elected, they must be given help in their work as deputies. And the deputy will not be alone, he will always be able to feel himself to be the leader of a group which follows him.

The DPCR is a democratic party. We do not demand from our members and supporters a single, unified world outlook and there can be believers and atheists, Marxists, and supporters of other philosophical trends in our ranks. But we are united by our vision of a future for world civilization as a community where harmony will be achieved between an effective economy and social justice, where the interests of social development and each individual will be decided in a way convenient to man.

What should such a society be called? Many people call it socialist. Others prefer the term postindustrial or technotronic society. We shall wait a while before arguing about definitions because the main thing is the path along which we intend to travel and along which the entire civilized world is now traveling. And we consider it our task to promote these reforms, which will insert our society into the unified world process of development.

We would like to see our economic system such that in it every person can by honest labor ensure a dignified standard of living for himself and his family and in which society as a whole can guarantee this living standard for its members who are not able to work. This can be achieved on the basis of a mixed economy in which all forms, including, of course, private enterprise, are represented.

Only when the economy is working with increasing momentum do real grounds appear for an active social policy. The working people's social protection ceases to be a slogan and is filled with real content, that is financial assets and material resources with whose aid it can be implemented. The party intends to come out with an initiative for implementing a number of social programs and to continue to control their implementation. These are not empty promises—we have already embarked on the preparation of such actions, relying on the potential of the Russian "Resurrection" social development fund.

We consider ourselves to be the party of the working people but our aim is to defend their interests not against the market but with the market's assistance, that is to build an economic system in which this defense becomes economically possible which, unfortunately, is not the case right now. The party is elaborating specific programs in the field of social and cultural policy, science, and education. We consider these all to be priority avenues of the development of society, important not only for our party but also for any political forces which have a responsible approach toward Russia's fate and future.

Republic To Protect Rights of Russians

PM0410103591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Position of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President's State Council"]

[Text] The process of the former USSR's disintegration has been accompanied in a number of areas recently by infringements of the rights of citizens living there who are ethnically related to the peoples of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. In this connection the top organs of RSFSR state power, the RSFSR president, and RSFSR people's deputies have been receiving appeals from citizens.

While respecting the peoples' right to self-determination and the acts of independence proclaimed on that basis by republics which were former members of the USSR, the RSFSR State Council reaffirms that the RSFSR intends to use all legal forms and methods envisaged by the norms of international law to protect the rights, life, honor, and dignity of citizens or Russian and other nationality who have left the RSFSR and are resident outside it.

For its part, the RSFSR pledges to strictly observe the aforementioned norms and procedures in respect of persons living on its territory, irrespective of their citizenship or nationality.

MVD Chief Murashov Briefs Press on Expectations

LD0410110591 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Video report by V. Martynov from news conference held by Arkadiy Murashov, head of the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs, in Moscow on 2 October; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The next in turn head of the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs met with journalists today on Petrovka street in Moscow. Arkadiy Murashov, a 34-year old thermophysisist, has become the first civilian head of this organization, but not the first one who was not approved by the Moscow City Soviet [Mossovet]. Therefore, part of the news conference was taken up by debates between Murashov and his Mossovet opponents—Deputy Chairman Yuriy Sedykh-Bondarenko and Deputies Aleksandr Tsopov and Vladimir Daineka—who do not recognize Murashov's right to be calling himself head of the capital's militia.

Arkadiy Murashov informed the journalists that, on his part, he holds the Ten Commandments as the only fundamental taboos for himself, that he believes in God, and at one time was a candidate for CPSU membership. The anouncement made by Arkadiy Murashov that he intends to invite private sponsors to finance the militia has given rise to the justified concerns among journalists, since the one who pays orders the music. Arkadiy

Murashov stressed that he was put at this post by the will of the political force of the Democratic Russia bloc which won the elections.

Chief State Inspector Makharadze Interviewed

PM0310101191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Oct 91 pp 1-2

[Interview with Valeriy Antonovich Makharadze, chief state inspector of the RSFSR, by Leonid Petrov; place and date not given; first three paragraphs are introduction: "Right To Obtain Satisfaction"]

[Text] "The sovereign's eye" is what journalists have dubbed the control directorate of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president's administration. The RSFSR president has appointed Valeriy Antonovich Makharadze chief of the directorate and RSFSR chief state inspector.

A brief biographical note will hardly say a lot about the man appointed by B. Yeltsin to one of Russia's top state posts. He was born in Makhachkala. His father is Georgian, his mother Russian. He has worked in Dagestan, Kamchatka, Udmurtia, and Kamyshin. In the spring of last year V. Makharadze, director of the Kamyshin forging and foundry plant, was elected chairman of the Volgograd Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. Since 14 August he has had a new appointment.

This career of a man who is not out of the ordinary, who did not belong to the old party nomenklatura or to the new, democratic nomenklatura, will surprise many people. But not us journalists. We took note of Makharadze long ago, when he put back on their feet the ailing plants in the third-rate Russian Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry. And he did the job: The same people, the same equipment, but suddenly everything started working, everything started earning, our traditional confusion disappeared who knows where, and each action acquired precise meaning. Therefore the fact that the new Russia has called for Makharadze to serve it is promising. It means that the time of talented people, the time of creation, has indeed come.

[Petrov] Valeriy Antonovich, the first 100 days of the first Russian presidency included an entire historical era: the collapse of communism and the disintegration of the empire. But they also included the establishment of a new, Russian, statehood. We are reckoning in days but foundations are being laid for decades, if not for centuries. What then is the supertask of your control directorate?

[Makharadze] Resurrecting the concept of the state official as a professional. As a state wise man. And resurrecting is a feeble way of putting it: I am now rereading Saltykov-Shchedrin and I can see that 100 and 150 years ago Russian state officials were infected with the same leprosy as today. The leprosy of lack of professionalism, of personal irresponsibility. The Russian official has always argued a lot but failed to deliver, agreed on a lot, but failed to decide.

After all we have reached the point where god forbid you should die on Saturday or fall ill on Friday—please wait until Monday, when the bureaucrat gets back to work. So that in the end who is serving whom—is the state serving the citizen or is the citizen serving the state? Why does the heating season scheduled, for example, for 20 September, begin on the 20th, but the next month? Why instead of a reasoned written reply to a complaint are you sent to one body then another and then another—and sent until you stop nagging of your own accord. Why, finally, is there such callousness, such hatred for the ordinary man in all state institutions?

Because there is no way of obtaining satisfaction from an official. And here we have been appointed by the president to ensure that this right—of obtaining satisfaction from an official of this kind—does appear.

This leprosy must be exterminated.

How? According to the same laws as in any other sphere of human activity. There are the requirements of technology and they cannot be violated. The exercising of power is also technological, also has its natural laws and canons. For the official there should be one canon—the law and the lawful decree of the lawful head of state.

The control directorate and I as chief inspector will thoroughly compare the rights granted to the official under the law on state service and his execution of state laws and the president's decrees. It is not that complicated to take and compare premises for taking decisions and the technology for implementing them and the results obtained. All this is finely calculated. But at the end we will receive a precise knowledge of the place in the chain of state management where there is a breach which dooms the entire system of presidential power to idleness. Or where actions are perpetrated which lead to results which are opposite to those intended.

And then we will say with complete justification that in a given ministry or territorial administration things are not going well for the following specific reasons:

—either the blame is with individuals who do not know what they are really doing or who are incapable of organizing matters properly;

—or the initial premises in the laws or decrees or other promulgations of the supreme organs of power were incorrect.

It is this mechanism, this system, that we are now building. Whatever political forces may win the elections later, whatever leaders then come to power, this machine will work and keep track to ensure that the entire state apparatus works only according to the laws of a given state and given territory.

And the head of state will correspondingly have feedback and the opportunity to eliminate defects in the mechanism of power swiftly and promptly.

Well, so far freebooters rule in our apparatus. Because the work of officials is assessed in the old way, superficially, by eye, to see if they are "pulling their weight" and that is all the analysis there is.

Here is a fresh example. A session of the Russian Supreme Soviet deemed the activity of the Council of Ministers to be unsatisfactory. On what grounds? On the basis of what figures, facts, or results? By virtue of what specific omissions? Who exactly displayed a lack of zeal and from what could this be seen? What lessons should executive power assimilate for the future? No one perceived this. And the benefit from such assessments was nil.

An official—and for me this is a good word, with a great deal of positive meaning—should remain alone with the law, the president's decree, and the duty to execute his state duty competently. When whatever chief may order him to "give this man information but not that one," he will be able quite rightly to object: "Esteemed chief, according to the law this cannot be done"—and will not fulfill such an instruction. And the president will protect such an official against possible persecution.

[Petrov] But then the functions of the control directorate in some respects overlap with the functions of the prosecutor's office....

[Makharadze] If they do, then it is only to a most insignificant degree. The prosecutor's office must keep track of the execution of the very letter of the law and do so in all spheres—in the organs of state management, the law enforcement organs, the economy, and in private life.

Our attention is focused exclusively on officials. Officials of all levels and all organs of executive power, it is true, but only officials nonetheless.... We shall control neither enterprises nor commercial structures nor public organizations. And why cars are not unloaded is not our business. On the other hand, in everything concerning state officials and their interaction with commercial and public organizations and their expenditure of budget money, that is the people's money, including currency funds, we shall establish the toughest control and liability will be immediate.

But our main difference from the organs of the prosecutor's office is that we are interested in the execution not so much of the letter of the law (if an official has violated the letter of the law then our talk with him is a brief one) as in the spirit of presidential decrees and Russian laws. That is the president's policy.

For instance, take the conduct of officials on the territory of the RSFSR during the days of the putsch. Everyone could see that this conduct was far from uniform but we will scarcely succeed in bringing many people to court with the plotters—the prosecutor's office will not find legal grounds for that.

Does that mean that the president had to leave their conduct without consequences?

Of course not. And these consequences have come swiftly for some officials. In Rostov Oblast, in Krasnodar Kray, and in other places the president has replaced the leaders of local administrations. The decisions taken by the president were based on the conclusions and recommendations of the information and analysis service of the control directorate of the president's administration.

As of the morning of 19 August and to this day this service has been studying and systematizing the information materials on the reaction of the organs of power, political parties, and public and official figures in the republics, oblasts, and krays of the RSFSR to the events of 19-21 August. Analysis has revealed five basic types of conduct—from overt support for the State Committee for the State of Emergency to resolute opposition to the plotters and unconditional support for the legally elected Russian leadership. And in between either covert support for the State Committee for the State of Emergency or temporizing or official support for the Russian leadership without any resolute actions. The August putsch was a litmus paper and the results of this analysis cannot fail to be considered in elaborating specific policy and planning particular appointments.

[Petrov] Had it not been for this putsch, the sequence of your steps as chief state inspector would have been different.

[Makharadze] To some extent of course it would have been different. We would have paid more attention to control and inspection of officials in the central apparatus itself: in the president's office, in the RSFSR Council of Ministers apparatus, and in the ministries.

[Petrov] A joke's a joke, but "the sovereign's eye" should look after the entire state. How rapidly will the control directorate find its feet? And how many officials—inspectors, auditors, and controllers—will you yourself need?

[Makharadze] I believe that within six months the president will have an entirely combat-capable organ.

As for numbers, we shall recruit not by numbers but by ability. And we do not intend to vie with the former people's control, in which several hundred people served in the central apparatus alone, not to mention the oblast and rayon echelons.

If, for instance, to inspect a ministry, department, or budget organization we need specialists we shall hire them under contract in nonstate, truly independent structures. Such an inspector will have no interest in "covering" for a particular department.

But above all we shall save on the organization of control. After all the situation in the center and locally has changed radically. The multiparty system has become a reality and all parties will seek shortcomings both in each other and above all in the organs of power. Criticism of people in power is a condition of the struggle for power. Whereas 19 and 20 August all democratic and liberal groups and trends united around the Russian leadership to resist the junta, as early as 21 August they had begun to set themselves against the organs of power and demand an answer from them—in the press and in parliament, at meetings and in statements. And not only in Moscow or St. Petersburg—everywhere.

The control directorate is thus left with the most trivial matter—analyzing all this critical information, separating the wheat from the chaff, and reporting to the president.

Finally we are counting very much on a fundamentally new institution in the system of presidential power—representatives of the RSFSR president locally, in the republics, krays, oblasts, and autonomous oblasts and okrugs, Moscow, and St. Petersburg. They are appointed and dismissed by the president himself and in the structure of our control directorate a special service has been created whose task is to help the president's representatives to cope as well as possible with the duties assigned them.

Representatives of the president are not only the first step toward the separation of state and municipal powers. Although the representative does not have the right to interfere in the activity of local organs and publish compulsory instructions, great strength is concentrated in his hands. After all he is directly linked to the president, he informs the president of the state of affairs, and controls the execution of RSFSR laws, the president's decrees, and Council of Ministers resolutions locally. And if he sees that Russian legislation is being ignored, that citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms are being infringed, that economic relations are being broken, then he has the right to suggest to the president that he bring the full force of state power to bear on the guilty officials.

The president's representatives have tremendous responsibility. They must ensure the rapid and effective interaction of Russia's top organs of power with organs of power locally, a collaboration free of any personal and political bias.

[Petrov] One last and perhaps delicate question: How secret or to put it more mildly confidential will the control directorate's work be? And do you not fear that your directorate and the president's local representatives will be simply inundated with denunciations and anonymous letters?

[Makharadze] We will not make any secret of our directorate's work. And we ask citizens who want to inform not to burden themselves in vain: Our analytical services work exclusively with official materials and our specialists derive from them just as much information as is needed to take justified decisions.

As for confidentiality, it will undoubtedly exist. After all, the relations between the president and his local representatives are build, inter alia, on a personal basis, outside the framework of administrative subordination. Their correspondence and exchange of opinions is in many ways a question of their personal relations with an inevitable subjective coloring. In my view it would be tactless to make them public. And in general there are things in which you simply need to trust the president.

Congress of 'Patriotic Forces' Proposed

PM0310140191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Sep 91 Single Edition p 3

[Article by Professor E. Volodin, chairman of the Coordinating Council of Patriotic Forces of Russia: "We Are Nothing Without Russia"]

[Text] Since 21 August 1991 we have been living in a new reality which is only just beginning to reveal its terrible visage. The six-year-old cliches about the victory of democracy, the end of totalitarianism, and so forth only benefit cunning politicians and their undemanding supporters. What is true in these cliches is only the fact that we can now bid farewell to the carefully fostered illusion that the "democrats" are engaged in furious combat with the "partyocrats" who reduced us to the situation we are in today. In actual fact—and the patriotic movement has repeatedly stated this—there was no such battle. Both the former and the latter, by their combined efforts, but with a different degree of success, have destroyed something far greater than a politicoeconomic system. They have destroyed a state system which, it should be repeated yet again, was created not by the last seven decades, but by many centuries of interethnic, interstate, economic, and cultural collaboration between peoples who recreated a great power which is now disappearing into historical oblivion.

Neither politicians nor a significant stratum of the population in the former Union republics had sufficient wisdom to understand a simple truth—when state integrity is destroyed it is replaced by a painful and historically lengthy period of the creation of new state formations that must determine territorial, economic, and ethnic realities with their neighbors. And this is not theoretical blather or good-natured parliamentary chatter about sovereignty, but a very harsh reality fraught with the danger of catastrophic consequences for all levels of the newly created national state structures. Let us recall also that in the referendum two-thirds of the population of the former USSR supported the unity of the country. Politicians who ignore this opinion now will in the future run up against all manner of forms and methods of opposition to any actions which deepen the

gulf between ethnic, confessional, and economic links and forms of collaboration that have developed over the centuries.

Analysis of the apparent and the secret causes which rigidly interlinked the events of 19-21 August lies ahead, but we can be sure that even an open trial, if one takes place, will not explain the internal causes of the disastrous, three-day transformation of a great state into a conglomerate of pseudo-states fraught with the danger of discord and social explosions dangerous to the former USSR and to the whole world.

And it is true that the preconditions for conflicts are already protruding from beneath heartwarming discourses about a "single economic space" or "coordinated political actions." The Ukraine has declared itself free from nuclear weapons, but has not explained from where it will get or who will give it—an independent country—the billions of rubles, dollars, or karbovantsi [Ukrainian currency] to rid itself of these weapons. On the other hand, the no less freedom-loving Kazakhstan is already claiming to possess nuclear weapons and does not intend to part with them. What will follow from this for the neighbors, near and far, of this new state in the history of mankind, no one can predict, including the authors of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

And of course, the problems of strategic weapons mentioned here do not cover the whole range of questions posed by the tragedy of the destruction of the unified state. We can reason loftily as much as we like about a "single economic space," but when the market throws out onto the street a many millions of unemployed people, for each "sovereign state" the problem will immediately arise of protecting its own economy from the masses of people trying to find a better lot elsewhere. All the "sovereign states" will move toward famine together, and in order to avoid hunger riots they will be forced to stop their blather about a "single economic space" and much else besides.

The most frightening prospect is that of interethnic conflicts in the "states" which were given Leninist-Stalinist borders which have nothing in common with the real, historical territorial distribution of ethnic groups and their ability to take root in the geographical area allotted to them. Racist laws in the Baltic region and separatist actions by the rulers of Moldavia and Georgia show specific ways of solving interethnic problems. The complex versions which arose in Azerbaijan and Armenia are well known. In Kazakhstan attempts have already been made to settle by their own means mutual relations with the Ural and Semirechye Cossack troops. Incidentally, within the Baltic itself even among the "indigenous peoples" themselves there is none of the unanimity hymned throughout these years. Here too a long and painful process of establishing genuine statehood lies ahead, especially in the event that neighboring Russia, or Germany, which is drawing nearer to the Baltic states, wants to realize its own historical and geopolitical interests there.

All of the above directly affects our long-suffering Russia and concerns all patriots and the whole patriotic movement. And the first thing that all of us should realize is that what happened in August and is continuing now is a political coup which wiped out the artificial "opposition" between Communists and "democrats." As events since 21 August have shown, the party is entirely incapable of action, even in the defense of its own property. The party leaders have betrayed the rank-and-file members. Dispersed on "different sides" of the barricades, Communist leaders have now closed their orderly ranks under the flag of Russia's commercial fleet, and, God be praised, they have delivered the patriotic movement from the illusions and compromises which it had to make during the period when the Communist Party, far from being a "union of like-minded individuals," was an element of the state structures. Since the end of August the political disposition of forces has become clear and definite. Subsequent events can happen only with action by and collaboration and **political** confrontation between the "democrats" who have found themselves at the summit of power and the opposition patriotic forces. Communists, betrayed by their leadership, will now have to make their own choice themselves.

Both democrats and patriots have their own truth and their own concept of Russia. These are so different and essentially incompatible that some people have long been wanting to arrange for the Russian people yet another civil war, yet another round of mutual destruction, this time total and final. Now much depends on the leaders of the "democrats" who have assumed the burden of historic, state, and national responsibility. These leaders will be the first to answer for the subsequent development of events in Russia, but the patriotic movement should not remain on the sidelines of events and refuse to participate in the task of national and state salvation, if this task is to be accomplished by Russia's present political leadership.

I have long been a political opponent of B. Yeltsin. I remain so now too, and not out of personal antipathy, but because of my own convictions and nonacceptance of "democratic" plans and programs to turn Russia into a backwater of civilization. But when B. Yeltsin declared that Russia was seizing so-called Union property, he was stating what the patriotic movement has been insisting on during all the disastrous perestroyka years and it would be absurd not to agree with this act.

Since the start of the first so-called interethnic conflicts the patriotic movement has been demanding that Russia take under its protection the "Russian-speaking" populations in the former union republics. Now Russia's top political leaders have declared the same, and the patriotic movement should support this declaration and monitor its fulfillment. For Russia's new leadership there is no getting away from the problem of preserving

a single army and hanging onto the strategic weapons and military bases that have suddenly found themselves in the hands of the newfangled "states" (for example, the naval bases in the Baltic and the Black Sea). It may be remembered that it was after 21 August that talk of Russia's unity and indivisibility first passed the "democrats'" lips. Such words were formerly swearwords in their circles, and they categorized them as part of the vocabulary of out-and-out "Russian chauvinists." But possession of power automatically requires these words as a description of the political organization of Russia, unless once again those who have taken hold of power wish to Balkanize or Lebanonize Russia within its current artificial borders, distorted as they are by the "friendship of peoples." If all these questions are to be resolved in a statesmanlike manner and in the interests of Russia, it is necessary to participate in their resolution to the height of one's powers, and without political blinders.

What I have just said by no means signifies that the "democrats" who have assumed responsibility for Russia's fate are now expressing Russia's national and historic interests. Their positions are well known; their ideas about the economy, social policy, national problems, and international relations have almost no points of contact with the position of the patriotic forces. This is why we earlier deliberately chose the path of distancing ourselves from the "democrats" and why we are now becoming the opposition. For this reason the very important tasks placed before the patriotic movement by the events of August 1991 need to be resolved in the very near future.

To ensure that a new totalitarianism does not arise in the future when economic chaos and imminent famine require the introduction of emergency measures, the patriotic movement must hold before the end of 1991 a unifying congress and adopt a program for its actions in the capacity of opposition. Now we will muster our strength and create a political program to organize Russia, to conserve its statehood and independence, to ensure the social protection of the population and civil peace, to restore its defense capability, and to combat tyranny, lawlessness, and crime.

This unifying congress should be viewed as the beginning of the first stage of a political campaign for the election of the next Russian president. Everything which is happening at the present time indicates that the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" under which the "democrats" came to power is finished, and that presidential power together with the powerful executive structures now counts for far more than the so-called legislative power. We have been landed with yet another version of neo-Bolshevist totalitarianism which is fraught with the danger of a repeat of everything which we have experienced in previous decades. This is precisely why we should launch the campaign for the next Russian president—a president who thinks and acts patriotically and nationalistically. Only by electing such a president will patriotic forces be able to revive in our country the best traditions of people's power which evolved over the centuries and which are not abolished either by revolutions or by putsches, nor by the latest legal order.

Of course, we will have to operate in very difficult conditions. But it was far harder for those who lived and worked in Russia at the beginning of the century, drained their cup to the dregs, but at the very beginning of their creative work said openly and courageously: "You do not frighten me." Let us follow this call. We only have one Russia. We are nothing without Russia.

'Viewpoint' Poll on Russia's Allies Within Union

OW0410084891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0743 GMT 4 Oct 91

[From "Veiwpoint": "Russia's Allies Within the Union: Who Are They?"—INTERFAX headline; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The news agency DATA reports the findings of an opinion poll carried out by the National Public Opinion Studies Center (VCIOM) among 994 people in 13 Russian cities on September 28-29. The poll was meant to find out who the Russian people would like to have as their allies within the renewed Soviet Union.

Asked whom they would prefer: The Balts or the Central Asians, 38 percent of the respondents said they would like to live side by side with both. 24 percent spoke out in favor of the Baltic people, and 10 percent said they preferred an alliance with the Central Asian republics.

15 percent of those polled said they did not want any kind of alliance at all.

50 percent of the Russians believe no territorial claims should be advanced to other republics for at least 10 years. 27 percent said the advancement of such claims was a pressing need. 23 percent remained undecided about the matter.

The statistical error margin was set at plus/minus 1.5 percent.

Asked whose life was more difficult in Russia today—men's or women's—58 percent of the respondents said women were facing greater everyday difficulties in the republic. 12 percent expressed the opposite opinion, and 30 percent said they did not know.

KGB Chairman Says Emphasis on Fighting Crime

LD0410074691

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 2220 GMT, in the "Television News Service" program, carries a 2-minute interview by reporter Ye. Shilova with V.V. Ivanenko, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] KGB.

Introducing the report, announcer Nazarova says that the USSR "could soon go the way of Yugoslavia."

Shilova's recorded interview then begins with Ivanenko, who says the RSFSR KGB's functions are "intelligence and counterintelligence." He does not explain this further. Ivanenko notes that the emphasis will be on fighting organized crime. "In light of the August events, it is very important to take measures to prevent anticonstitutional actions and terrorism," he says.

On rumors of a new coup attempt, Ivanenko says no definite plans are known, but "it can be said social tension is increasing. The threat of social explosions is great. I think the new scenario for a coup will be built on what is called a controlled social explosion. We are taking measures on this, but I would not like to reveal all these professional secrets now."

Concluding the interview, Ivanenko says that "talks are in progress on setting up an interrepublican collective security body. I think an agreement will signed in the next two or three months."

KGB Analyst: Situation 'Worse' Than Before Coup

LD0410075591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0700 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Text] The situation in the Soviet Union today is worse than it was before the August coup because there is an absence of any civilian control over the Army and the state security bodies. A correspondent of the Russian Information Agency learned from confidential sources that this was stated by Colonel Vladimir Rubanov, chief of the USSR KGB's Analytical Department, speaking at an international conference entitled "Topical Problems of International Security."

This forum was organized at the initiative of the Association of Independent Publications and the Center for Research into Problems of National Security and Strategic Stability. It was held behind closed doors at Nakhabino, near Moscow, 1-3 October. Taking part in the conference were many top officers of NATO and the Soviet armed forces, employees of Western intelligence departments and the USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] KGB, diplomats, and scientists.

Serious concern at the situation in the USSR, especially in connection with the collapse of the Union structures and the emergence of potentially new nuclear powers was voiced in the speeches by the Western participants. In the opinion of the Soviet and Western participants, the experience of NATO, operating on the principles of consensus and collectivism in adopted decisions, is of interest for the possible organization of collective security within the framework of the former USSR. The Western representatives noted that, in conditions where all the former Union republics are going through an acute economic crisis, collective defense efforts will be less expensive than setting up their own defense structures.

General Brian Kenny, deputy commander in chief, Armed Forces, Europe, gave the assurance that the NATO leadership is not planning to draw either East European countries, or the former Soviet republics, into it.

Filshin To Head Economic Relations Ministry

OW0310130591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As IF [INTERFAX] has been informed, Russian Deputy Minister for Foreign Economic Relations Gennadi Filshin will head the ministry. Orders of the Russian cabinet signed by Deputy Prime Minister Oleg Lobov say that Victor Yaroshenko is relieved of his duties of minister and Filshin is appointed acting minister.

Economic Council Chairman Comments on Resignation

PM0410092591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 91 Single Edition p 2

[Report on interview with M. Bocharov, former chairman of the Russian Supreme Economic Council, by G. Yastrebtsov; place and date given: "Mikhail Bocharov: 'I Wanted To Do the Job, But They Would Not Listen to Me...'"]

[Text] We are informed that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Reopublic] Supreme Soviet Presidium has accepted the resignation of Mikhail Bocharov, chairman of the Russian Supreme Economic Council [SEC]. In a statement addressed to Ruslan Khasbulatov, acting chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, he said that it was inadvisable that he should continue to work on the SEC because numerous economic studies had been rejected.

I telephoned M.S. Bocharov at the Supreme Soviet and asked him to explain what SEC proposals had not been accepted for implementation.

"We made many such proposals," Mikhail Aleksandrovich said. "For example, the blueprint for a political and economic union treaty, which was put forward last December and which we elaborated in the light of EEC experience. It presented in detail a section on Union property, which, as is known, is a stumbling block even now. At the end of April a tax reform blueprint was elaborated in conjunction with some high-powered U.S. experts. It could have been put into practice within a matter of months. It is an extremely important issue for Russia and for the whole country—indeed, our incomes still by no means tally with our taxes. Finally, in May, 17 May to be exact, we proposed the creation of an Interrepublic Economic Council. It is, in fact, the prototype of the organization headed by Ivan Silayev which does not exist yet, except on paper.

"In short, I and my SEC colleagues wanted to do the job, but I did not get much of a hearing. It was just that I did not see, I did not feel that there was any positive reaction on the part of the Russian leadership. It was than that I decided to go...."

"What will you be doing now?"

"I will be spending the day as one of the ordinary Soviet unemployed. But to be serious, I will be concentrating on my work as president of the 'BUTEK' Concern. Now is not the time to be prattling on, standing open-mouthed, or scrapping for 'top seats.' There are interesting plans, there are good contacts with several industrial enterprises. Our economy is in deep crisis. I will do all I can to help our homeland beat this crisis."

Exchange Bank Plans To Increase Capital Base

OW0410024991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2341 GMT 3 Oct 91

[From "Soviet Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian Exchange Bank (REB) announced in Moscow Thursday that it planned to bring the bank's capital base to 3 billion rubles before the end of October 1991. At this point, REB has a capital base of 500 million rubles.

When the Russian Exchange Bank was set up in August 1991, it had a capital base of 250 million rubles. Among its founders are: the Russian Exchange Centre, the Real Property Exchange, and the shareholder company Invest Trade.

REB plans to specialize in crediting and financing exchange transactions and to found new banks in various areas of the USSR.

The Russian Exchange Bank is currently among the top five Soviet banks in terms of capital base, said a bank official. If it increases its capital base to 3 billion rubles, REB may become No. 1 among Soviet commercial banks.

N. Fleet Vessel Staff Considering Strike

LD0410113891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0430 GMT 4 Oct 91

[From the Central Press Review]

[Text] KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA as always, in almost every issue, manages to find news which can be referred to with the journalists' favorite word a first. True, this time, the first is a very pleasant first. The fact is that the history of our country's Navy has not known anything like it. A conference of the staff of the auxiliary vessels of the northern fleet has set up a strike committee and announced its intention of striking.

The essence of the conflict is the following: Formerly, the civilian staff of the Soviet Army and Navy in the Far North area enjoyed the same benefits as those in civilian services and had wages one and a half times higher than the latter. Last year, a decision of the Council of Ministers of Russia came out on granting enterprises in the Far North the right to channel 50 percent of profits into the material incentives fund and on raising from 300 to 400 rubles the sum of wages on which the northern supplementary allowance coefficient is calculated.

Naturally, this did not affect the Union structure. Since the Navy is also on a budget balance, there can be no talk of profits.

The strikers have compiled a letter containing their demands and sent it to the command. However, the reply from there is that the strikers are, of course, completely right, but the commanders are powerless to help them.

At the present time, the president has an appeal from the Ministry of Defense containing a request to increase the wages of civilian staff and to raise the ceiling from which the northern allowances are calculated. The papers are waiting to be dealt with, but people do not intend to wait. If the issue is not resolved within two months, the first strike will be staged in the history of the Soviet Army, the newspaper concludes.

Soldiers' Mothers Strike for Removal of Official

OW0410000891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Activists of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Committee of Soldiers' Mothers (CSM) are on a hunger strike outside the White House (RSFSR parliament) in Moscow pressing the demand that Anatoliy Alekseyev be replaced with a CSM member as head of the State Committee for the Affairs of Army Servicemen and Their Families attached to the Soviet president. Women activists are also demanding two hours of air time on national TV for committee leaders.

The CSM leader Lyubov Lymar told IF's [INTERFAX] reporter that Alekseyev's committee had been putting brakes on inquiry into the death or traumatization of servicemen during peace time. She said Mikhail Gorbachev had promised at a meeting with leading CSM activists earlier this week to suspend on the 1st of October the decree appointing A. Alekseyev to his post. According to Ms. Lymar, soldiers' mothers will insist that Mr. Alekseyev also resign as head of the RSFSR parliamentary commission investigating the death and traumatization of Army servicemen because he "has launched a campaign of provocations and misinformation" against the CSM.

On Thursday, the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers sent the acting head of the RSFSR parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov a message spelling out their demands.

Local Affairs

Yeltsin Meets With Krasnodar Administration Head

LD0310163691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] An RIA correspondent has learned from well-informed sources that Russian President Boris Yeltsin, who is vacationing in Sochi, had a lengthy conversation with Vasiliy Yakovlev, head of the Krasnodar Kray administration. The meeting mainly concerned matters relating to the development of the agro-industrial complex and socioeconomic problems in the Kuban area. Specific proposals have been examined.

Gomel City Soviet Elects Non-CPSU Chairman

PM0310133991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Sep 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Mikhail Shimanskiy under the "Direct Line" rubric]

[Text] Gomel—A woman has become chairman of the Gomel City Soviet of People's Deputies. S. Goldade, a native of Gomel, has been elected to this post. She has never been a member of the CPSU and is a person of democratic orientation. The election marathon lasted almost a year through three sessions and seven elections, and at last we have a result.

Negotiated Settlement of Dnestr Conflict Urged

PM0410104591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

["Statement by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Secretary"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Events in the Dnestr region recently have been causing profound concern in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. The situation in the region has been specially studied by members of the RSFSR president's State Council.

Historical experience shows that attempts to resolve any conflict by strong-arm or confrontational methods never have the desired results for any side. It is a dead end.

In this connection RSFSR state advisers have been appealing to the parties to the conflict to show political and human wisdom, refrain from violence, coordinate their actions with the norms of international law, and behave in a civilized manner. They have been forced to particularly emphasize that the whole world perceives it as totally impermissible to prevent deputies from performing their duties or to violate deputies' immunity.

We express the hope that the sides will find it possible in the very near future to get around the negotiating table and resolve their contradictions through conciliation.

In the event of agreement between the sides it is possible that the question of RSFSR representatives' participating in the talks as mediators could be examined.

[Signed] RSFSR State Secretary G.E. Burbulis

Kemerovo Democratic Bloc Members Hold Meeting

LD0410081391

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 220 GMT on 3 October carries a two-minute report from Kemerovo in which an unidentified correspondent reports on a recent meeting of the deputies of the oblast soviet's members of the democratic bloc. The deputies speak about the debates on the appointment of the personal representative of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic president and on the stabilization of the political life in the oblast. The democratic bloc deputies propose that issues of social protection, the status of the Kuzbass as a free enterprise zone, and the regional program of privatization should be discussed at a future oblast soviet session.

The correspondent notes that the inflation rate in the oblast is already 12 percent higher than the average throughout the Union. This means that the 63 million rubles of help that has been paid to pensioners and invalids in the first half of this year has been reduced to nothing.

N. Ossetia Supreme Soviet Discusses Border Issue

LD0410084191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] law on the rehabilitation of repressed peoples was the main item on the agenda of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. By decision of the Supreme Soviet it is intended to examine the issue of changing the republic's borders in strict accordance with the constitutions of the USSR, the RSFSR, and North Ossetia, and a declaration of state sovereignty, according to which the republic's territory cannot be changed except by the will of the people. After an interval, Ingush deputies left the session as a mark of their disagreement with the proposals that were voiced. South Ossetian deputies who intend to propose reunification with North Ossetia in the framework of the Russian Federation are taking part in the session proceedings.

Labor Alliance Organization Registered in Siberia

PM0310141991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 91 Single Edition p 4

[Report by V. Sapov: "Top Secret: Siberian Residence Permit for People's Labor Alliance"]

[Text] Novosibirsk—There is an addition to the family of social organizations: A Siberian regional organization of the People's Labor Alliance has been created here, with branches in Irkutsk, Omsk, Tomsk, and Barnaul. Its

purpose is to propagandize in all possible ways the idea of making common cause among the peoples and uniting them for Russia's revival.

"After the August putsch we adopted a decision to stop fighting the regime (totalitarianism had collapsed) and actively participate in constructive work," A. Kanayev, chairman of the regional organization of the People's Labor Alliance, says. "The People's Labor Alliance advocates radical economic reforms. The Alliance prepared the document 'Seven Reforms of the National Economy.' Our organization forms part of the 'Democratic Russia' bloc. But we do not intend to reform as a party."

Only recently Soviet propaganda was negatively disposed toward the People's Labor Alliance, whose headquarters are based in Frankfurt-am-Main. The opinion was that dyed-in-the-wool anti-Soviet elements, traitors to the homeland, and CIA agents had entrenched themselves in it. But in actual fact, as the People's Labor Alliance leaders say, this organization never had anything to do with the CIA, nor with any other foreign organization. The Alliance stood out in the emigrant community in that it refused all dubious subsidies. And it is not for nothing that the Americans recently closed down its radio station "Free Russia."

People's Labor Alliance supporters living in Siberia also have a radio station. They welcome the emerging convergence in favor of the wide propagation of orthodoxy, the establishment of freedom in the spiritual sphere, and values common to all mankind. But as far as the headquarters are concerned the following question is now being debated: Should it not be transferred to Russia, where the democratic process is already irreversible and consequently the need for prompting from the outside has disappeared?

Tatar CPSU Members Aim To Obtain Sovereignty

New Socialist Party Proposed

PM0310124191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 91 Single Edition p 1

[Report from PRAVDA-TASS-RIA roundup under the general heading: "Around the Country"]

[Text] An action group of Tatar CPSU Republic Committee members headed by First Secretary Revo Idiatullin has stated its intention of turning the republic's CPSU organization into a republic socialist party. According to this group's statement, the new party will back democratic reforms, the creation of a mixed market economy, the strengthening of the republic's sovereignty, and parliamentary forms of party activity.

Democrats To Hold 1st Congress

OW0310215791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2023 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The first congress of Tatarstan's democratic forces, which opens in the city of Almetyevsk on October 5, is expected to produce a single platform for the republic's democratic parties and movements. The congress will attract people's deputies of the USSR, Russia and Tatarstan, activists of the Tatarstan Public Center, local branches of the Democratic and Social Democratic parties of Russia, the parliamentary group NARODOVLASTIYE (People's Power), and representatives of the league of entrepreneurs, cooperators, leaseholders and farmers.

President Sets Up State Council

OW0310223791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2023 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Mintimer Shaimiyev of Tartarstan has issued a decree setting up a state council attached to the president. The decree says the new council will "deal with key issues of the home and foreign policies and maintain interaction with the republican and local authorities."

Apart from the president and vice president, the 15-member council involves the head of the Baltakhin District Council Marat Akhmetov, the head of the Kazan Executive Committee Kamil Iskhakov, Prime Minister Mukhammat Sabirov, one of the ex-leaders of the republican CPSU committee Rafael Khakimov and others. Four of them were on the former Presidential Council that had worked for only 2 months before it was dissolved on July 29.

On Wednesday, the presidential press center officially denied the rumors that M. Shaimiyev had recently called Russia's leader B. Yeltsin over the telephone to inform him of the Tatar leadership's intention to suspend the republic's pro-sovereignty efforts. The two presidents had had the last telephone conversation on September 6, the press service said.

Paramilitary Volunteer Force Created

OW0310223891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2023 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At the initiative of the Tatar Public Center (TPC), a paramilitary volunteer force has been under formation in Tatarstan since the end of last month. One of the TPC leaders, Rashat Safin, told BBC that the objective is "to protect the republic's sovereignty in view of Russia's

refusal to recognize it, and to remove the possible barriers in the way of obtaining real independence."

Vladivostok Open to Foreigners; Poses Problems

PM0310142391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Sep 91

[Report by Leonid Savitskiy and L. Borisenko; from the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Russian President Yeltsin has signed a decree on opening up Vladivostok. Leonid Savitskiy reports.

[Savitskiy] Our Far Eastern port, a very large transport center at the crossroads of major international sea lanes, will finally start operating as one of the most important links in the process of economic and sociopolitical cooperation between the countries of Southeast Asia and North America. The largely artificial restrictions on the permanent presence of foreign citizens in Vladivostok imposed because of the presence of the military have been removed. And as of the new year, foreign ships will be allowed to put into its harbor. So the city's original purpose as the center of Russia's international trade in the Pacific Ocean has been restored. The government has also decided to create a free enterprise zone here—Greater Vladivostok.

[I.L. Chernyanskiy, first deputy chairman of Maritime Kray Executive Committee, identified by caption] Of course in the end we hope it may acquire some of the characteristics of Singapore, Hong Kong, and Asian trade capitals.

[Savitskiy] But for the time being, the opening of the city has just given the local authorities something to worry about. After all, Vladivostok does not have even tolerable conditions for accommodating foreign guests. No infrastructure has been created here for foreign diplomatic and trade missions to be able to operate properly.

Struggling Railcar Project Seeks Business Backers

PM0310152191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 28 Sep 91

[Report by V. Mishin and A. Avdeyev; from the "Television News Service" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] As is known, in the past all commuter trains were produced at only one plant in the country, located in Riga. This plant is now located what could essentially be described as abroad....

[Mishin] It remains to be guessed who was more farsighted then, back during the dawn of the perestroyka—the CPSU Central Committee or the Union Council of Ministers. Whatever the case, in 1985 these two authorities adopted a joint resolution on the construction of a railcar production facility at the village of Demikhovo in Moscow Oblast's Orekhovo-Zuyevskiy Rayon.

This enterprise has now become highly topical. However, five years have passed and it is obvious that a fate characteristic of other Union ventures has also befallen this construction project. Constant difficulties with the provision of funds, materials, and equipment have resulted in the completion to date of only 20 percent of the planned volume of work.

So what is the solution? The plant's collective believes that it is essential to transfer the project to Russian jurisdiction, privatize its fixed capital, and involve business circles in this project.

[Ye.V. Usov, plant chief engineer] I believe that there have always been good businessmen in Russia, and, wherever they may be, we are inviting them to join our production project.

[Mishin] Let's hope that the appeal of the plant's collective will be heard and that the time will come when our own comfortable commuter trains will whizz around the country just like the troikas did at one time. [120553]

External Affairs

Sobchak To Help Normalize Tajik Situation

LD0310153191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1400 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] A RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY correspondent was informed at the Secretariat of the St. Petersburg Mayor's Office that today Anatoliy Sobchak flew to Dushanbe on the instruction of the USSR president to obtain full information on the situation in Tajikistan and to render assistance in normalizing the situation. Sobchak is expected to return on 9 October.

Left Centrists Urge Name Change, Join NATO

OW0310224091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Council of Regents of the Russian Monarchy, activists of the Russian National Party and the left-centrist radical bloc of political parties and movements held an extraordinary joint session in Moscow on Wednesday, urging the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president and parliament to consider the opportunities for the Russian Federation's incorporation into NATO. They appealed to parliaments and heads of state in various countries to immediately begin the full elimination of nuclear and strategic offensive arms.

The session urged Russia's parliament to remove the words "Soviet" and "Socialist" from the republic's official name. There were calls for scrapping the post of president of the Soviet Union but preserving the republican presidencies, and for dissolving the union KGB.

The session adopted a resolution saying that Russia's relations with the Ukraine and Georgia should be based on the historic decisions of Bogdan Khmelnitskiy and King Georgiy. The left-centrist bloc confirmed its recognition of the independence of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

Media

Newspaper Editors Picket Press Ministry

LD0410075391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0230 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Text] Staff from the editorial office of the newspaper (GEN) have picketed the building of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Ministry of the Press and Mass Media. The reason for conducting this action is the refusal by the ministry to reregister their newspaper.

Sverdlovsk Asked To Discontinue Publication

LD0410044891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 2000 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] The RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY reports that the Sverdlovsk Rayon people's court of the city of Moscow has received a petition from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Ministry of Press and Mass Media for discontinuation of publication of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper on the grounds that in the course of this year it has repeatedly violated Article 5, Chapter 1 of the USSR law on the press. Now it is up to the court.

International Affairs

Rutskoy Holds Talks With Afgan Prime Minister

Khaleqyar 'Satisfied' With Results

LD0310185491 Moscow TASS in English 1836 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Vasily Titov]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—A meeting between Russian Vice President Alexsandr Rutskoy and visiting Afghan Prime Minister Fazl Haq Khaleqyar was held in Moscow's House of Russian Soviets today.

TASS was told at the vice president's secretariat that the sides discussed the situation in Afghanistan and around it and prospects for bilateral cooperation.

The two emphasised favourable conditions were being created lately for a comprehensive political settlement of the Afghan conflict. The joint Soviet-U.S. statement on Afghanistan was an important step on this path. The sides stressed the need to go ahead with vigorous efforts to elaborate an international consensus on the Afghan problem, which could expedite a cessation of hostilities and forge an internal Afghan dialogue.

In considering the state and prospects for developing relations between Russia and Afghanistan, the participants of the meeting favoured a vigorous search for new mutually acceptable forms of cooperation and also developing direct links between regions and cities in Russia and provinces in Afghanistan.

Rutskoy and Khaleqyar discussed most substantially the problem of releasing former Soviet servicemen who were taken prisoner in Afghanistan. Rutskoy stated Russian leaders attached particular importance to this problem and would exert every effort to solve it as soon as possible. Khaleqyar confirmed the Afghan side's readiness to continue assistance to these humane efforts.

"I am satisfied with the results of the talks. There are all grounds to hope for an energetic development of the mutually beneficial dialogue on problems discussed today," Khaleqyar told journalists after the end of the meeting.

Efforts for Settlement Viewed

LD0310224791 Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Vasiliy Titov]

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—"Russia may have its own role to play in an Afghan settlement, and the republican leaders intend to exert every effort to dispel the long-running conflict," Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy told journalists after a meeting with Afghan Prime Minister Fazl Haq Khaleqyar today.

Rutskoy said the present meeting with the head of the Afghan Government as well as the Russian leaders' intention to hold talks shortly with the governments of Pakistan and Iran and also to form direct contacts with representatives of the Afghan opposition should be viewed exactly in this context. "We believe a vigorous tripartite dialogue—Russia-Pakistan-Iran—aimed at concluding an agreement should become a significant contribution towards solving this problem," Rutskoy stressed.

He thinks a clear-cut accord to solve the problem of former Soviet servicemen who are in captivity should be a component of this agreement.

On the republican leaders' plans to meet members of the Afghan mujahedins' "interim government," Rutskoy noted that a consent to hold such a meeting was given in principle and it is expected to take place in mid October. Although, he added, "There have not yet been specific names of representatives from the opposition."

Rutskoy said the Russian leadership intended to provide food and energy aid to Afghanistan. "Certainly, the situation in our republic is grave, but not to the extent as to refuse to help. Our support will help stabilise the situation in Afghanistan and prevent the present crisis from spilling over into slaughter and hunger."

Rutskoy emphasised this aid would not be a charity. The principal task is to forge cooperation, including direct links between separate regions and specific producers.

"Our efforts to achieve an acceptable variant of a settlement in Afghanistan are coordinated with the activity of Union structures. I hope that these joint efforts will make it possible to dispel the conflict and the next spring will be peaceful in Afghanistan," Rutskoy said.

Envoy Comments on Relations

OW0310181891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1645 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy met with the Afghan Prime Minister F. Khaleqyar in Moscow on Thursday. The parties agreed that there are good opportunities for a comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan and called for new and mutually acceptable forms of cooperation between Afghanistan and Russia. The prominent Soviet expert on Afghan affairs and special envoy Nikolay Kozyrev told IF [INTERFAX] that "stopping Soviet arms supplies to Afghanistan as of January 1, 1992 does not signal that we break off all relatin with Kabul." He said in order to settle the Afghan conflict at an early date, the Soviet Union would have "serious talks" with Pakistan in the near future. According to Mr. Kozyrev, the United States and the United Nations are ready to exert pressure on Islamabad to make it join the work for peace in Afghanistan

Lack of Funding Threatens Kola Peninsula Project

PM0310145391 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 26 Sep 91

[Report by G. Shugayev and G. Ivashko from Murmansk; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Top experts from the United States, Britain, Germany, and Australia are meeting in the Kola Peninsula again. For 20 years now fundamental research into the earth's crust has been under way at a super-deep borehole on the Kola Peninsula. The borehole has reached the record depth of 12,160 meters. The cost of the program also marks a record—it is ten times lower than that of a similar German program. However, even these sums of money appear to be more than our budget can cope with.

The promising program, which boats unique equipment and tremendous intellectual potential, is threatened with closure.

This has caused consternation in the scientific world, which led to the idea of creating an international scientific center in the north of Russia by pooling efforts and funds.

Reform Group Issues Communique With SDS

AU0310193391 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1730 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text of joint declaration signed between the Bulgarian Union of Democratic Forces delegation to the USSR and the Movement for Democratic Reforms in Russia in Moscow on 3 October and read by Mikhail Nedelchev, member of the delegation—live]

[Text] The Joint Declaration of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] delegation and the Movement for Democratic Reforms signed on the occasion of our delegation's visit reads as follows:

Our meetings were meetings of people who share the democratic ideals, people who believe in universal human values. We ascertained our full mutual understanding in our common approaches and views.

We exchanged opinions on the economic and political situations in Bulgaria and the Soviet Union. We discussed the complicated problems facing our two countries. We are convinced that solution of the current difficulties is possible, but only through prompt and radical reforms likely to assert market relations and encourage the spirit of enterprise and initiative.

We confirm our mutual striving to develop and preserve our good relations of mutual respect and between the peoples in our two countries. These relations are our common asset, which was achieved throughout many centuries.

The further development of extensive relations between our two states in the political, economic, humanitarian, and other spheres should be based on such relations.

We also share a common evaluation of the situation in the world and in Europe, in particular. We are convinced that exceptionally favorable conditions exist today for the consolidation of the community of all European states.

Unfortunately, the current unrest and the conflicts existing in the Soviet Union and in the Balkans seriously complicate the future prospects of the European process. We are deeply concerned about the attempts of reactionary forces in both our countries to take revenge under the banner of nationalism and by fanning national hostilities.

We reject violence, dictatorship, and monopolism. We are confident that our peoples are committed to democracy, because they have suffered for it. The bitter experience of many decades under the totalitarian regime taught us this lesson.

We are resolved to proceed side by side along the path shown by worldwide civilization.

The declaration was signed by Stoyan Ganev, on the Bulgarian side, and by Eduard Shevardnadze, on the Soviet side.

Interregional

Republic Officials Comment on Nuclear Weapons

LD0310223991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Report by correspondent Fuad Ogly; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] An issue which was not raised at the meeting in Alma- Ata but in which everyone is interested is the fate of the nuclear installations located in the territory of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Kazakhstan.

[Belorussian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich] We do not want to possess nuclear weapons nor bear the cross of anxiety borne by those countries possessing such weapons. Let us be honest, however, and admit that the NATO alliance exists and that it does have armed forces. This means that the first defensive shield in the path of the Western countries is Belorussia and the Ukraine.

[V. Grinev, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet] I think that the nuclear weapons should remain at their launching positions. This is a point of principle, and there is no need, so to speak.... [changes thought] Well, I did not very much like Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's statement about Russia appropriating all the weapons. It has created tension. [passage omitted including indistinct portion]

Belorussia

Idea of Becoming EC Associate Member Explored

OW0310224191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO at 1540 GMT]

[Text] The head of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Belarus, Stanislav Shushkevich told a news conference in Mensk on Tuesday that the Belarusan delegation that had returned from Germany on Monday [30 September] had visited that country "not to beg for money but to get an advanced nation to share new technology and expertise." He said he had met with many entrepreneurs and heads of large corporations and banks to discuss, among other issues, the opportunities for Belarus to obtain the status of an associated member of the European Communities.

According to Mr. Shushkevich, direct air flights will open between Mensk and Frankfurt-am-Main in the near future, and the German Consulate in Mensk will be granting entrance visas to people traveling to Germany.

Ukraine

Defense Minister on Army, Nuclear Weapons

LD0310144191 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Sergey Balykov]

[Text] Kiev October 3 TASS—"The Ukraine needs an army as a guarantor of democracy and independence," Air Force Major General K. Morozov, Ukrainian defence minister, said in an interview with the NARODNAYA ARMIA newspaper. Troops deployed now on Ukrainian territory will be a basis for its creation. These include three military districts, the Black Sea fleet and some individual units. They all will undergo a radical reform. This work will be carried out jointly with the General Staff, in accordance with the act on state independence of the Ukraine and a resolution of the republican parliament about military units deployed on its territory.

The Ukrainian armed forces will never have nuclear weapons, Morozov stressed. The strategic forces with a nuclear component, deployed on its territory, are already being set apart. They should be managed by a single control body with the participation of the Ukraine. The future of the nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory will be decided in line with the course, proclaimed by the declaration on state sovereignty. It says that the Ukraine intends to become a neutral state, not to join military blocs and follow three non-nuclear principles through the stage-by-stage reduction of nuclear weapons in accordance with the existing treaty and further agreements with sovereign republics.

Army groups in the Ukraine will be transformed into the structures of future Ukrainian armed forces. The administrative control bodies—the Defence Ministry and the General Staff—are being created. In the future the structures themselves will be reformed. The strength of the group will be dramatically reduced, control bodies of military districts will be liquidated and a system of military training will be reformed. All the structures will meet the principle of reasonable sufficiency.

The future of military educational establishments became a very important problem for the Ukraine, which affects the interests of many people. A system of higher educational establishments, needed for the Ukrainian armed forces, is being developed proceeding from their requirements. Some military schools will probably be reformed after this problem is discussed with other republics, with due consideration for their demand for the training of personnel on a contractual basis. We need a General Staff academy of the Ukrainian armed forces. When tackling those problem, it is necessary to preserve the scientific potential and the teaching and material base, the minister said.

Draft Decision Worked Out on Defense Council

OW0410001391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2023 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] IF [INTERFAX] has been informed that a draft decision has been worked out in the Ukrainian Parliament to set up a defense council in the republic. The draft was prepared by the commission on defense and state security. The council is to include the president (presidential elections are scheduled for December 1), the prime minister, the chairpersons of several permanent parliamentary commissions, the state minister for the defense complex and the conversion of the military industry to civilian production, the Defense and Interior ministers, the chairman of the National Security Service of the Ukraine (the successor of the KGB), and the commanders of the Republican Guards and border troops. At its plenary sessions to be resumed this month, the Ukrainian Parliament is planning to discuss a decree on the formation of the Defense Council.

Crimea Seeks To Leave Ukraine, Rejoin Russia

Rally Held in Sevastopol

PM0310141091 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Oct 91 First Edition p 5

[Report by Captain 2d Rank V. Pasyakin under the rubric "Direct Line. TASS and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Correspondents Reported Yesterday": "Crimean Peninsula: Between Russia and the Ukraine"]

[Text] Sevastopol—At a rally sanctioned by the city authorities, held at the "Chayka" stadium in Sevastopol, the participants condemned the "unconstitutional act of handing Crimea over to the Ukraine 19 February 1954" and demanded a decision on its repeal and the return of the Crimea to Russia. A decision was adopted that in the event of Russia's refusing to allow the Crimea to join it, autonomous status within the Union should be demanded. It is planned to hold an all-Crimea referendum before 1 December, to clarify the wishes of the peninsula's inhabitants and determine its future.

Crimean Question Discussed

LD0410085291 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Text] A permanent representation of the Ukrainian Republic in Russia has opened in Moscow. The first Ukrainian ambassador is Vladimir Petrovich Kryzhanovskiy. Kryzhanovskiy is a member of the opposition in the Supreme Soviet but in Moscow he is defending the interests of the republic. In particular, on the question of Crimea.

[Begin Kryzhanovskiy recording] We are very concerned that many people in Russia are trying to make decisions on this problem. Generally, this is a problem for the Ukraine and the Crimean population. We will solve it together with the population of Crimea. We urge Nikolay Travkin and many others to concern themselves more with the Russia's problems. This also includes Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov.

There are many problems waiting to be solved in Moscow. I think that Crimea will remain in the Ukraine. I am convinced that the population of Crimea will vote for an independent Ukraine. One should never forget that 80

of everything supplied to Crimea comes from the Ukraine. No matter what happens to Crimea, it will continue to be part of the Ukraine. We have a land border and so things will be always dictated by the economy. [end recording]

Supreme Soviet Leader Kravchuk Continues Tour

Contacts U.S. Business Circles

LD0310192791 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 2000 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Text] The chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet's final meetings in the United States were particularly full of contacts with American business circles. In the morning of 1 October, the Ukrainian legislative chief visited the New York Stock Exchange. He held conversations of mutual interest with leading representatives of big business and familiarized himself with mechanisms of U.S. economic policy formation and the influence of the exchange on the state of the world economy.

The meeting in the New York headquarters of one of the most influential U.S. nongovernmental organizations—the Council for International Relations—passed on a high representation level. Discussion was on the need for expanding Ukrainian contacts with the world community. Kravchuk stressed that adoption of Ukrainian declaration of sovereignty became a watershed in its history. Together with the act of proclamation of independence this makes it possible to create on Ukrainian territory an independent state which has its own exclusive constitution and laws. Our people have taken the path of independence and the reversal of this path is impossible, Leonid Makarovych Kravchuk stressed.

The American point of view regarding expanding Ukrainian influence on the formation of the world economy and politics was expressed by Peter Turner, the president of the Council for International Relations, who gave an interview to UKRINFORM correspondents. He said in particular that the current meeting with the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet chairman, who will probably become its first president, has attracted great attention from the council's members because, frankly speaking, a serious problem that the United States faces when beginning to determine its strategy of relations with republics of the former USSR consists of a rather swift development of events. In our view there are pros and cons to Soviet restructuring, said Peter Turner in conclusion, it shows

the peoples' aspiration for radical reforms, however, at the same time an extreme slowness in implementation is striking. It seems that Ukrainian leaders have learned lessons from this experience.

Kravchuk's meeting with editors of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, the leading daily newspaper of America's business world, also took place on Tuesday [1 October]. He gave them an exclusive interview. Another long meeting with journalists took place in the editorial office of the popular economic and political FORTUNE magazine. The reception that was arranged in honor of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet's chairman on behalf of U.S. business circles by leaders of [words indistinct] and Hill and Knowlton companies, became an important final event of the day. Kravchuk addressed a speech to American businessmen. He invited them to visit the Ukraine assuring that new possibilities are opening now for entrepreneurship and mutually beneficial partnership.

Working Visit to France

OW0210225391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2100 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] INTERFAX has learnt that on 3rd October Leonid Kravchuk, the president of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, will undertake a working visit to Paris at the invitation of French President Francois Mitterand. He will have talks with President Mitterand, with Monsieur Fabius, President of the National Assembly and with Foreign Minister Roland Dumas. Particular attention will be paid to the possibilities for economic cooperation between France and the Ukraine.

Mr. Kravchuk has already visited Germany, Canada and the United States where discussions concerned not only questions of economic cooperation, but also the establishment of consular relations.

Seeks Cooperation in Engineering

LD0310215191 Moscow TASS in English 1943 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Georgiy Mikhailin]

[Text] Paris October 3 TASS—Chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Leonid Kravchuk arrived here today on a one-day working visit at the invitation of French President Francois Mitterrand.

The Ukrainian delegation also includes republican Minister of Foreign Affairs Anatoliy Zlenko and Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Valeriy Kravchenko.

At the airport they were welcomed by Ukrainian permanent representative to the UNESCO Aleksander Slipchenko and officials from the French Foreign Ministry.

Kravchuk is expected to discuss with President Mitterrand, president of the National Assembly Laurent Fabius and Foreign Minister Roland Dumas prospects for the development of bilateral relations.

"In the first turn, we would like to discuss the deepening of economic cooperation in such priority for the Ukraine spheres as power engineering, aircraft-building and electronics," Kravchuk told TASS.

"We also intend to consider the establishment of political cooperation since the Ukraine has become a sovereign state," he added.

Talks With Mitterrand

AU0410080191 Paris AFP in English 0051 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Text] Paris, Oct 3 (AFP)—Ukranian President Leonid Kravchuk on Thursday [3 October] said his republic will take part in any meeting discussing a reduction of nuclear arms and their total destruction.

"We want to wipe out nuclear weapons," he said at a news conference here, adding that he was opposed to any transfers of nuclear arms from one nation to another, except for scrapping purposes.

Kravchuk arrived earlier Thursday for a one-day visit at the invitation of French President Francois Mitterrand.

Ukraine, now a republic of the Soviet Union, could become a member of a European confederation "as an independent state, and not as a republic in a state", Kravchuk said. A future European confederation of independent states has been proposed by the French president.

Mitterrand listened "very carefully" to his analysis of the situation in the Soviet Union and of the future of Ukraine, he said. Ukraine would pursue its "democratic route" but needed Western aid to be rapidly able to introduce "internationally-recognised standards," he added. "Otherwise we will still get there, but it will take time."

Kravchuk ruled out any Ukrainian part in a political Union replacing the old Soviet Union, as Ukraine could "only have direct relations with the other republics" in the economic and collective security fields.

Kravchuk was accompanied by his foreign minister, Anatoliy Zlenko, and two members of the Ukrainian opposition, Igor Yukhnovskiy and Dmitriy Pavliychko. He also held talks with Foreign Minister Roland Dumas.

Talks with Mitterrand focused on future cooperation in atomic energy, space travels, electronics, television, and the 1986 nuclear disaster in the Ukrainian town of Chernobyl, he said.

Views on Independence, Presidential Candidates

Poll Favors Union of Independent States

LD0410050591 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 2000 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] Sociologists of Zaporozhye center for the study of the region's public opinion and socio-economic problems demographically selected 361 people. These people were asked to answer the following questions: Who, in your view, has the most chance to become president of the Ukraine? Of those polled, 50 percent said Leonid Kravchuk, 10 percent said Vyacheslav Chornovil, 6 percent said Yuriy Shcherbak, and 5 percent said Levko Lukyanenko. Of those polled, 23 percent did not express their opinion.

Two more questions were presented to participants in the poll: Are you convinced of the necessity for presidential rule in the Ukraine? What does the independence of the Ukraine mean to you? The overwhelming majority, 78 percent, answered the first question positively. Another 4 percent are afraid of the institution of personal dictatorship. Some 5 percent do not see an adequate candidate for this post among the present politicians, while 6 percent do not believe that anything will change in the Ukraine. In regard to the second question, only 21 percent of those polled link the independence of the Ukraine with a complete break in relations with the Union, while 67 percent think that the republic's independence should be put into practice in a Union of independent and strong states with equal rights.

Odessa Opposes Independence

LD0310131391 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2000 GMT 1 Oct 91

[Text] Odessa—The Odessa Memorial Society has come out categorically against the sovereignty of the Ukraine. In their view Odessa is not a Ukrainian city. This city is a so-called free port with a Russian inclination, and Memorial members believe that if Ukrainian independence is supported by the 1 December referendum, the Ukrainian language will be imposed on the city by force; i.e. the process of forced Ukrainization will start. The Memorial society has started collecting signatures against holding the referendum.

Rukh Leader: Need to Accelerate

PM0410103991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 91 Single Edition p 5

[TASS report: "I. Drach: 'There Is No Freedom in the Ukraine'"]

[Text] Tokyo, 1 Oct—The Ukraine and the Ukrainians have not yet acquired genuine freedom. In the interests of achieving independence it is necessary to accelerate the demarcation of borders, the issuing of our own currency, and the creation of an army, Ivan Drach, chairman of the Ukrainian People's Movement (Rukh), said in an interview published in the Japanese newspaper TOKYO SHIMBUN today.

According to the Rukh leader, the conflicts in Georgia, Moldova, and other republics are due primarily to the preservation of the center. He believes the Ukraine could conclude a treaty with a group of republics favoring the preservation of the federation, but as an independent state. Acknowledging the existence of an independence movement in the Crimea, the Donbass, and the Carpathian region, I.F. Drach advocated a respectful attitude toward autonomy. But the Ukraine is united, he stressed.

Possibility of 'Spontaneous Strike Disturbances'

LD0410081891 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 2000 GMT 1 Oct 91

[Text] The All-Ukrainian Association of Working People's Solidarity, workers' strike committees, carried out a warning picketing of the Ministry of Justice in Kiev. The appeal disseminated before reads that the discriminatory actions of the Ukraine's Ministry of Justice with regard to the All-Ukrainian Association of Working People's Solidarity became apparent with the several months' delay of this association's registration. The VOST, an abbreviated name for the group, is almost the only organization in the Ukraine that seeks to implement this protection under conditions of economic chaos and the lack of guarantees of social protection. Therefore, delaying its registration is a dangerous line of the Ministry of Justice which could provoke spontaneous strike disturbances.

Law on Environmental Protection

91WN0686Z

[Text]For this law published in the 24-25 July 1991 PRAVDA UKRAINY, see the FBIS Report Soviet Union: Republic Affairs, FBIS-USR-91-033, dated 24 September 1991, pp 74-91.

Law on Enterprise Tax Law

91UN2609A

[Text]For this law published in the 14 August 1991 PRAVDA UKRAINY, see the FBIS Report Soviet Union: Republic Affairs, FBIS-USR-91-033, dated 24 September 1991, pp 91-93.

Law on Income Taxes

91UN2477A

[Text]For this law published in the 16 August 1991 PRAVDA UKRAINY, see the FBIS Report Soviet Union: Republic Affairs, FBIS-USR-91-033, dated 24 September 1991, pp 94-104.

Moldova

Republic Renounces Payments on USSR Foreign Debt

AU0310184091 Paris AFP in English 1824 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] Chisinau [Kishinev], Moldova, Oct 3 (AFP)—A senior Moldovan official said Thursday that the republic would not contribute to repayments on Soviet foreign debt acquired after January 1 this year.

Speaking to the Moldovan Parliament, Economics Minister Konstantine Tampiza said Moldova had not received any funds or other investment from the central authorities in Moscow since the beginning of the year when a new government was set up in the republic.

He said it would be "foolish" for the Moldovan government to make payments on foreign debt acquired by the central Soviet government since last January. Soviet experts have placed the country's overall foreign debt at around 76 billion dollars.

President Mircea Snegur meanwhile called on the Moldovan Parliament to approve the republic's membership in the new economic union among the republics and said such a move would not prevent Moldova from joining other economic alliances such as the European Community.

"Even in the best of circumstances if we were accepted in the EC it wouldn't mean we were going to sever our ties with the former republics," Snegur said.

Pro-reform deputies in the Moldovan Parliament said Thursday they opposed joining the economic union because it could continue to give Moscow a large say in the management of Moldovan affairs.

One deputy said Ivan Silayev, the head of the transitional Soviet government, had described the new economic union agreement as "the economic basis for a political structure."

Liberation Via 'Unification With the Motherland'

AU0310144091 Bucharest DREPTATEA in Romanian 26 Sep 91 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Grigore Vieru, honorary president of National Christian Party of Moldova, by unidentified reporter in Chisinau [Kishinev] in September 1991: "How Can We Achieve This Sacred Act—Unification"]

[Excerpts] [Reporter] You have talked about your great sufferings and about the way the Romanians in Bessarabia were decimated after the occupation in 1940, during the war, and during the famine of 1946. You have mentioned how the best managers and intellectuals were taken to Siberia, and also talked about the people's suffering during the long process of introducing the kolkhoz system with Soviet tanks in the doorway...

[Vieru] It is a great miracle that we were able to survive.

[Reporter] What about the unification?

[Vieru] How can we carry out this unification, how can we achieve this sacred act now when the Romanians—through no fault of their own—are so different and so split. I believe that we have to become an independent state, a truly independent one. Let us wake up our people, let us bring the stray ones back home and slowly, slowly the unification will happen naturally.

The unification has to happen; our complete liberation will be achieved only through the unification with the motherland. I do not visualize any other salvation. For, we cannot exist in a state—be it even independent—made up of a few Russianized villages and towns. We cannot live in an artificial state cut off from its roots.

[Reporter] What do you think—in general terms—about the situation of our people today?

[Vieru] I am very dismayed at the split among the Romanians. [passage omitted] Some articles that hurt us unjustifiably have appeared in the press across the Prut River. [passage omitted]

[Reporter] What about the future?

[Vieru] I am optimistic. I still think that we will see the end of the tunnel—all of us, the whole country, and the country across the Prut River. However, I am not so optimistic as to believe that we will be united in one or a couple of years. But neither am I so pessimistic as to disbelieve that we will be together by the end of this century.

September 1991.

Law on Citizenship

91UN2507A

[Text]For this law published in the 4 July 1991 CURIERUL DE SEARA, see the FBIS Report Soviet Union: Republic Affairs, FBIS-USR-91-031, dated 17 September 1991, pp 53-57

Law on National Bank

91UN2509A

[Text]For this law published in the 13 July 1991 CURIERUL DE SEARA, see the FBIS Report Soviet Union: Republic Affairs, FBIS-USR-91-031, dated 17 September 1991, pp 57-63

Law on Bank Activities

91UN2612A

[Text]For this law published in the 3 August 1991 SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA, see the FBIS Report Soviet Union: Republic Affairs, FBIS-USR-91-031, dated 17 September 1991, pp 63-67

Georgia

Opposition Guards Withdrawal From Tbilisi Settled

OW0310131391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] IF's [INTERFAX's] correspondent reports quoting the press service of the Georgian opposition, that the withdrawal of rebellious National Guards of Lengiz Kitovani from Tbilisi is to begin at 17:00 local time on Thursday. On Wednesday Kitovani and the head of the Merab Kostava society Vazha Adamia announced that militarized groups loyal to them will leave their positions and the city within two days. The two opposition figures said they were willing to promote a settlement.

However, they said that if the authorities start any repressions against the opposition, it reserves the right to act according to their civic and political convictions. The declaration was made in the presence of representatives of the Catholicos of All Georgia Ilya II.

There has been no official response to the declaration.

Meanwhile, the press center of the National Security Council reflecting the viewpoint of the authorities has announced that the ultimatum on the surrender of weapons by the opposition has been extended from 12:00 to 17:00 on Thursday. If weapons are not surrendered, the inhabitants of houses around the TV center which is occupied by the opposition will be evacuated from their homes.

'Joint Accord' on Withdrawal

LD0310180891 Moscow Cental Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 3 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" program]

[Text] Georgian Supreme Soviet deputies told journalists today that the opposition's proposals on the withdrawal of armed formations from Tbilisi have met with understanding from the leaders of several subunits. They emphasized that the National Guard, headed by Tengiz Kitovani, which is refusing to subordinate itself to the Georgian president, and the militarized part of the all-Georgian Mirab Kostav society have concluded a joint accord in which they have unilaterally agreed to leave the buildings and territories they control in Tbilisi.

At the same time, they have stated that should there be any repression of the opposition, these formations will take action as the situation demands.

'Tension' Mounts, Deadline Passes

LD0310162391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1542 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS-SAKINFORM correspondent Eduard Ediberidze]

[Text] Tbilisi, 3 Oct (TASS-SAKINFORM)—The deadline for the surrender of weapons by the armed opposition to the authorities, established by Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia, expired at noon today. At that time its members would no longer have been liable to criminal prosecution. The conditions presented by each side, however, are still mutually unacceptable. The opposition has refused to give up its weapons and the authorities will not enter into any talks without this precondition.

In the afternoon, tension in Tbilisi reached the crisis point. Tengiz Kitovani, who leads National Guard units who have refused to be subordinate to the president, told a TASS correspondent that by 1700 today they intend to vacate the television and radio department building they are occupying and leave the city.

Meanwhile, appeals are being broadcast from government house to those who live near the radio and television building to leave their homes urgently. Residents of a high-rise block of apartments with several means of access have been asked to evacuate their homes. Television and radio reports are warning the inhabitants of Tbilisi and visitors to the city that they should not be in this area today, especially after 1700.

National Guards Leave Positions

OW0310180591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1645 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to IF's [INTERFAX's] correspondent in Tbilisi, after the term of the ultimatum advanced by Georgia's National Security Council expired, rebellious national guards led by Tenghiz Kitovani left the city circus and moved to the TV center. Volunteers from the Merab Kostava Society led by Vazha Adamia left their positions too. The National Guard is expected to begin leaving Tbilisi altogether in a matter of hours.

Addressing a rally outside parliament on Thursday, President Zviad Gamsakhurdia congratulated people on "the putschists' defeat." He reiterated that "blood will not be spilt; the people will use exclusively peaceful means to pressure the putschists into laying down their arms."

The Georgian leader predicted that "healthy forces" in Parliament would condemn "the rebels" during the next parliamentary session, due to open shortly.

An opposition-sponsored rally is under way outside the TV center in Tbilisi.

Opposition Units To Remain in Tbilisi

LD0310195491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1826 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By SAKINFORM-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Tbilisi, 3 Oct (SAKINFORM-TASS)—Units of the Georgian National Guard supporting the opposition have decided not to give up their arms and not to leave the city, as they originally planned to do. Having left the building of the television and radio department this evening, where they had been present in recent days, the guards have been relocated elsewhere. National Guard Commander Tengiz Kitovani stated that his armed formation will be stationed within the city bounds to come to the aid of the opposition if armed force is used against it. He stated we are not subordinate to any political party, but our aim is to defend democracy.

Opposition Representatives Hold News Conference

LD0310182391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1612 GMT Oct 91

[Report by correspondent Yuriy Korotkov in Moscow at a news conference "devoted to the problems of human rights in Georgia"]

[Excerpt] I am in the building of the Memorial Society, in Malyy Karetnyy Lane. Representatives of opposition organizations are holding a news conference devoted to the latest events in Georgia. It is being held by the representatives of the opposition who arrived in Moscow today: Zurab Zhvaniya, speaker of the Greens Party; David Berdinishvili, deputy of the Republican Supreme Soviet from the Republican Party, member of the Democratic Center faction; Ivlian Khendrava, cochairman of the Union of Free Democrats of Georgia, and Guram Mamuliya, independent citizen of Georgia, as he presents himself. They have again reaffirmed their four main demands: to observe the law on the press, to hold early parliamentary elections, to release political prisoners, and to see President Zviad Gamsakhurdia resign.

These demands have been fostered by the fact, opposition representatives said, that basic human rights have been systematically and grossly abused in the republic: Dissidents are being persecuted; there are political prisoners; there are no democratic institutions; the mass information media are being usurped; centralized Soviet socialist structures are being strengthened; impermissible delays in implementing economic, financial, and agrarian reforms are taking place; legislative, executive, and judicial authorities are being concentrated in the same hands; human rights commissions are not working; the republican parliament is inactive.

Representatives of the opposition believe that Gamsakhurdia has usurped power, something which is fraught with catastrophic consequences. They even said at the news conference that Zviad Gamsakhurdia is not quite mentally healthy and insist that he should be given a certificate of health. Only after that could any talks be held with him. The dangerous point is that the opposition is hostage to the official force. The outcome of the struggle is unclear for the time being. The representatives at the news conference believe that consolidation of all democratic forces, not only in Georgia but also in Russia and in the international community, is the only way out.

And one more thing: It was just announced at the news conference that the deadline for the government's ultimatum on disarming the National Guard expired at 1200 today. The Guard, however, is not laying down arms but has decided to leave Tbilisi. In short, the opposition is struggling not with Gamsakhurdia but for human rights. [passage omitted]

Gamsakhurdia To Convene Parliament 'Soon'

AU0310175491 Paris AFP in English 1744 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] Tbilisi, Georgia, Oct 3 (AFP)—Georgia's embattled President Zviad Gamsakhurdia told a mass rally here Thursday that the opposition had been "defeated" but said he would "soon" convene a session of the local parliament, one of the main opposition demands. He spoke shortly before Georgia's armed opposition forces finished evacuating the city's main television headquarters, where they have been defending opposition leaders occupying the building since the political crisis turned violent last month. Gamsakhurdia's announcement met a key demand of the president's critics, who have repeatedly urged that parliament resume work that stopped in September when the situation degenerated.

It was his first public statement since the surprise announcement Wednesday night by the armed movements backing up opposition leaders that they would withdraw from the capital. The president told some 10,000 supporters who gathered outside the parliament building, where he has holed up during the crisis, that their decision to pull out was proof of "their defeat."

"I want to hail the defeat of the putschists," he said using the name he has called those who challenged his rule. "It happened as it should have since they were acting against the interests of Georgia." Gamsakhurdia had issued an ultimatum that opposition troops—which include much of Georgia's national guard angered by his plans last August to disband their force—lay down their arms by noon Thursday.

Opposition leader Tenguiz Sigua, a former prime minister, had repeatedly spoken out against any disarmament, saying the arms were the opposition's only defense against arrest. His stand caused an attempt to negotiate a settlement to the conflict Sunday night to fall apart. Gamsakhurdia's opponents charge him with stifling dissent, arresting critics, mismanaging the Georgian economy, and running affairs like a dictator since his popular election last May. Sigua was uncharacteristically quiet Thursday, however, with no comment on the withdrawal. He was driven away from the television

building at 5:30 p.m. (1440 GMT) in a red car that also carried Tenguiz Kitovani, the head of the rebel national gurads. But several opposition members on Thursday were calling the decision to pull out an "error" and predicted that new "repressions" would begin as soon as the armed forces left.

Kitovani, who had announced the withdrawal decision Wednesday night, again warned Thursday that his troops would attack parliament should Gamsakhurdia make any new attempt at "repressions." He spoke in a brief statement to the crowd outside the television building before he left. Huge, daily support rallies have been staged by both sides in the conflict.

On Wednesday night, Kitovani had said his men and other armed opposition troops would withdraw to a "secret" location close to the capital, ready to intervene "in the name of the people" if Gamsakhurdia did not seek what they called a constitutional solution with his opponents. The last transport vehicle carrying rebel national guards and their equipment pulled away from the television buidling at 6:30 p.m. (1530 GMT). Six tanks as well as several trucks and cars left from the television buidling, while other vehicles evacuated rebel national guards from the nearby Tbilisi circus, the other site that had been occupied by opposition troops.

In all, some 60 vehicles were involved in the withdrawal, carrying both troops and equipment which included two anti-aircraft cannons. They headed towards the east of the city, to the applause of a few thousands supporters gathered to see them off. Uniformed Georgian police were to deploy Thursday evening around the two buildings evacuated by the opposition.

Deputy Interior Minister Roman Gentsadze had shown up at the television headquarters Thursday morning, prompting local journalists to suggest that a political "compromise" had been reached between the government and opposition. But Kitovani early Thursday denied there had been any last-minute compromise. There were other small signs of detente Thursday after three days of extreme tension that at one point Tuesday heared Gamsakhurdia vowing that his enemies would die.

The main daily, the Republic of Georgia, which remains under government control, for the first time published articles written by political figures who criticized Gamsakhurdia's policies.

And Avenue Roustaveli, the capital's main boulevard which had been blocked off to private traffic by government troops, was open again for the second day running.

Gamsakhurdia Calls For Reconciliation

4U0410143991 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 27 Sep 91 p 1

["Speech by Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia at the Rally Near the Building of the Parliament on 25 September 1991"]

[Text] Dear Friends: It is a very difficult day today. The unworthy sons of our nation are responsible for making this morning black for us. I wish we never had to witness it. Georgians have lifted up their hands against Georgians and Georgians have spilled the blood of Georgians—this is what we have come to. Let us honor the memory of the victims with a minute of silence.

Dear friends, it is already clear where all of this is issuing from and who wants to spill the blood of his own brother. It is those who have realized that the Georgian people cannot be defeated with the help of an alien army or foreigners. Georgia can only be defeated by the hands of Georgians, as has happened in our history more than once. Now, they want the same. In order not to allow this to happen, we must unite.

Those people who have pitched their camp not so far from here are flying the flag of Tbilisi, the flag of our capital. Aren't we Georgians?! Perhaps, we are not Tbilisians and have arrived from other rayons to take away their dwelling place? Whom does this alienation suit, when Georgian rayons are being estranged from the capital? Did not our fathers once arrive from rayons? Where do their ancestors come from? Why should people be so blind?

I want to appeal, first and foremost, to the residents of Tbilisi. Dear Tbilisians, not only those who are standing here but also those who are there, my heart bleeds when I see to what extent your minds have been confused to make you spill your brothers' blood. Yes, you are our concern and I feel pity especially for you: You are under a delusion. Do you really think that the aims that you have set yourselves can be achieved? Will you achieve, with the help of removing me, everything that you have been dreaming about—a happy life and privileges? The reverse is true, because chaos will ensue and a catastrophe will take place. You do not realize, in your state of delusion, that this will not lead to anything but chaos. In the name of the love for my people and in the name of peace, I would have really resigned if I had been sure that this would not ruin our people. There is one thing that these people do not understand—they will not achieve their goals by their hatred for me and by stirring up the vicious campaign against me. No, they will not! They will not come up to anything but a catastrophe!

Again and again I call upon those who are flying the "Tbilisi" banner, those who have submitted to the influence of the ominous communist propaganda, which alleges that Georgia is not an integral whole, but rather Tbilisi, Rustavi, Kutaisi, and Zugdidi, each taken separately, that the Georgians are divided into Zugdidians, Kutaisians, Tbilisians, and Telavians, and that Georgians as such do not exist. This is precisely what the Bolsheviks and Communists wanted. They withdrew from use the word "Georgian," and they did not use it. "Our great motherland and our great Soviet Union"—this is their terminology, like also the "Tbilisian," "Kutaisian," or "Telavian...." Did people ever hear the word "Georgian" from their lips? This is to whose tune

the putschists are dancing today and this is in whose steps they are following! Are their actions sensible, my friends, if firing is aimed at non-Tbilisians in the name of Tbilisians? Is this their democracy if yesterday our wonderful and innocent young men were killed?!

Democrats and humanitarians, is this your humanitarianism? Are these your lofty ideals? You will be held responsible before the Georgian people for all of this!

However, my friends, let us seek ways out of this deadlock into which they have led us. It will be more accurate to say that they have driven themselves into this deadlock.

I am calling upon them once again: Lay down your weapons, disband this junta, and disband this illegal armed formation! You will not be harmed! Go back to your homes, start working, be Georgians, and be citizens!

However, our patience is not infinite. The patience of the Georgian people is not infinite. Come to your senses, while there is still time! Otherwise, we will not be able to help you. This is our call, my friends. Our city must not be a place for the outburst of the malicious little men's political ambitions. Not a single drop of blood of Georgians or of representatives of any other nationality must be spilled any more. Nobody's blood must be spilled in Georgia. Georgia must become a country of peace, harmony, and love! This is how we want to see Georgia.

Let us once more call upon them, appeal to them, and ask them, and if nothing comes out of it, then we will call upon Georgia to pass its sentence on them.

Long live peace!

Long live love for fellow-men!

Long live reconciliation!

If nothing helps, then—long live the struggle in the name of saving our fatherland!

Supreme Council 20 Sep Session Reported

AU0310202591 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 21 Sep 91 p 2

[SAKINFORM report: "The Session of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Georgia"]

[Text] On 20 September, the second meeting of the second session of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Council of first convocation continued. Before it began, Akakiy Asatiani, chairman of the Supreme Council, made a statement concerning the item on the first day of the work of the session that was shown on the "Moambe" ["News Teller"] program the previous day. Having established that it had omitted a whole number of deputies' speeches, he gave the assurance that a television report on the first day of the session would be repeated but in full, without any cuts.

Then, Dilar Khabuliani, minister of internal affairs, requested that he be allowed to communicate some information. He brought to the attention of the deputies the fact that, as has become known to him, Ossetian extremists led by local separatists had brought 10 armored personnel carriers from North Ossetia to South Ossetia. He said that this action threatens to exacerbate the already tense situation in this region. As Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia stated in connection with this, the Supreme Council should also express its opinion on the provocative decision of the so-called South Ossetian regional soviet to submit a request to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that nonexistent South Ossetia be joined to North Ossetia. On the suggestion of the deputies, it was decided to draw up the text of an appropriate statement to be addressed to the Russian parliament.

The Supreme Council warmly welcomed a delegation from the Democratic Party of Ingushetiya.

The following deputies spoke in the renewed debate that followed on the question of the political situation that has taken shape in the republic: David Kupreishvili, Avtandil Rtskhiladze, Teymuraz Mdinaradze, Robert Petriashvili, Tamaz Diasamidze, Medeya Tushmalishvili, Ruslan Gongadze, Gela Chorgolashvili, Avtandil Popiashvili, Viktor Domukhovskiy, Mirian Mirianashvili, Aleksandr Kobulashvili, David Berdzenishvili, Merab Uridiya, Irina Taliashvili, Maya Natadze, Liya Katsadze, Kote Pirtskhalava, Akakiy Asatiani, Tamaz Gamkrelidze, and Dzhoni Khetsuriani, minister of justice.

The results of the sharp debate on this question, which lasted virtually two days, were summed up by Zviad Gamsakhurdia. In particular, he again emphasized the necessity of conducting a constructive dialogue with the parliamentary opposition and of talking with the pseudo-opposition using the language of the law. The president unambiguously stated that only in this way could a civil war be averted and civic peace and accord be established in the republic. Mr. Zviad Gamsakhurdia demanded that everyone respect the Constitution and strictly observe the laws that have been elaborated by parliament and recognize their supremacy. He said that, at the present stage, calm and order in Georgia could and should be achieved only through the joint efforts of parliament and the president. The evening session lasted less than one hour. It suspended its work at the suggestion of republic President Zviad Gamsakhurdia, who informed the deputies that, at a meeting being held simultaneously in Republican Square, calls were being heard to storm the government building and to free the prisoners in jails. To avert unforeseeable consequences, the president suggested to the Supreme Council that the work of the session be suspended and that the deputies go to the meeting in order to prevent actions being taken.

Before the session suspended its work, the deputies heard two alternative draft resolutions on the question of the political situation in the republic that were presented

by the parliamentary faction "Democratic Center" and by the "Roundtable-Free Georgia" bloc. Following an exchange of opinions, the Supreme Council decided to prepare an agreed text of the resolution and submit it for ratification at the next meeting of the session.

The deputies then heard brief statements given by Dilar Khabuliani, the republic's minister of internal affairs, and Vakhtang Razmadze, procurator-general of Georgia, in connection with the incident that occured in Tbilisi on 2 September 1991.

As the chairman said, the deputies would be informed in due course of the date on which the session would resume its work.

WHAT WAS DISCUSSED IN PARLIAMENT

Extracts from the speech delivered by Z. GAMSAKHURDIA [name capitalized], president of the Republic of Georgia.

The report on the second session of the Supreme Council given in SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA yesterday and today is evoking great interest on the part of readers.... Today, we are additionally publishing extracts from the speeches delivered by Mr. Zviad Gamsakhurdia and representatives of certain political organizations on the first day of the session.

[Gamsakhurdia] The criticisms of the opposition are centered on the claims that there is no democracy, no freedom of speech, no opposition papers, no access for the opposition to television.... However, this is a complete lie. You can see that there is a multitude of opposition papers.... Yet, the world press, which is being supplied with disinformation by local people, claims that we have closed the opposition papers. This is not true! We are also trying to find a way to enable the opposition to express their views and present their platform on television.... Only the law on parties and the laws of the republic in general must not be broken during these television appearances. I believe this point is indisputable.... Therefore, this accusation is unjustified.

[Text] It is being claimed that we are not implementing privatization.... I must state that this requires a legislative basis that we have only just established. You know fully well that the Law on Privatization comes into force on 1 October. How could we have implemented privatization if a legislative base did not exist? How could we have implemented land reform when the corresponding law had still not been adopted by the Supreme Council? It is true that we—both parliament and the president—are guilty of delaying the process of preparing the legislative act.... What is the reasom for the delay? This needs to be investigated.... Who is specifically guilty? The opposition could have assisted the corresponding commission, in which case the law could have been adopted earlier.... Then the "street opposition" would not have used such misunderstandings in the pursuance of its aims.

The same can be said about the television question. Everything has been clearly formulated and all rights have been defined in the law on parties.... If we all act in accordance with this law, everyone will have his proper place.... After all, in all democratic countries of the world the activities of only registered parties are allowed. There is no country where rights are granted to any group that declares itself to be a party.... Therefore, all this needs to be evaluated fairly and the truth needs to be ascertained. Of course, we also are not always correct; we have made mistakes, but they have not been ill-intentioned. They have come about as a result of the general unfavorable situation....

Opposition has emerged here. However, it is becoming increasingly obvious that this unconstructive opposition is not an opposition. This is a group of people whose aim is to overthrow the lawful government elected by the people and to seize power. Criticism of the government and seemingly constructive demands for privatization and the freedom of the press and television are being used as a pretext. However, in actual fact, a struggle is going on, whose aim is to overthrow the government and, moreover, by extremely unworthy methods.

A putsch is taking place in Georgia; attempts are being made to overthrow the legal government by force. We must not close our eyes to this. We must evaluate all this legally, politically, and morally. The government and parliament are called upon to do this....

A section of parliament is being drawn into the struggle. I can clearly see why. The destructive and anarchic actions of the putschists have spread to parliament, and this is seen in the steps taken by certain members of parliament and their participation in the actions of the putschists. This is an exceedingly sad and regrettable fact that must be categorically evaluated.... I demand this! Either such actions have to be stopped or members of parliament must bear responsibility.... Those members who have supported the putschists in their attempt to overthrow our government....

By such actions, you, gentlemen, are alienating the Georgian people. There is the danger that the people will become divided into two camps and a civil war will start. I earlier called on you, the parliamentary opposition, to enter into dialogue when you were leaving parliament, I appealed to you.... I have also repeatedly called upon the "street opposition" to engage in dialogue, and I have often invited Irakliy Tsereteli [leader of the National Independence Party] here to speak with me but, each time, he has refused, suggesting that I meet him in some other place.... In what country is it permissible to summon the president somewhere for talks?... It is customary everywhere for any opposition to go to the president and to parliament to set forth its proposals and demands. We can even invite them here so that they can use this platform. However, they do not want this, friends! They have no arguments....

Georgia can only be saved through recognition of the supremacy of the laws. These laws, thank God, are not Soviet laws; they have not been imposed upon us by the empire.... These are own own laws... and unless they are observed our country could be faced with catastrophe. Yet, Georgia and the Georgian people will, in any case, save themselves from such a pseudo-opposition, from destructive forces....

Let us rise above personal passions!

Extracts from the speech delivered by V. Adamiya (the [All-Georgian] Merab Kostava Society) The reason we left the previous meeting of the session was not because of disagreements over [live] television coverage, but because we can see that serious errors have been committed in all spheres—political, economic, cadre policy....

If you recall, at one of the sessions I warned that if things continue like this, in a few months people with sticks will charge in here....

We are not the opposition. We are part of the ruling bloc. However, we demand a restriction on the powers of the president, the resignation of the Presidium of the Supreme Council, political and economic liberalization....

I appeal to you all to show reason and not to view differing opinions as being hostile. If any of you have better proposals, the 17 members of our Merab Kostava Society who are on hunger strike will adopt your position. They must be brought into the structures... the structures of administration, into the business structures, into the executive structures.... If we do not do this, it will be our fault, the fault of the government....

Do not forget that it is all of us who must answer for the mistakes of our government.... **Extracts from the speech delivered by A. Asatiani (the Union of Georgian Traditionalists)**

No one is insured against making mistakes. However, we are gradually acquiring the experience of political life and political relations. It is my impression that opposition is arising on unacceptable principles. Take, for example, the resignation demands.... It is possible to hold talks on everything.... However, how can one demand the resignation of the Supreme Council Presidium when it is made up of the chairmen of the parliamentary commissions?....

What is the main thing? The main thing is a feeling of responsibility for our words and deeds. Let's be frank.... It's impossible, after all, to do everything at once. One has to realize what is permissible and what is not. There has to be a desire for mutual relations.... If we don't have this, the successful construction of a new state is impossible.

We should take into account the experience of our forebearers in 1918-21....

We should analyze the reasons for our opposition and draw the correct conclusions.

Extracts from the speech delivered by V. Tsagareyshvili (The All-Georgian Society of St. Ilya the Righteous)

Much can be said about the political situation that has taken shape in our country today. Much is being said. However, such a situation was written about long ago—in the Bible. When Moses was leading the Jews to the promised land, they opposed their leader.... Thus, it took them another 40 years to achieve their goal.... If we read the Bible today and if we analyze the situation, our present situation corresponds precisely to that described in the eternal book....

When people ask me why I am with Zviad Gamsakhurdia, I answer that in him I see Moses. Not to be with him today signifies a betrayal of the Georgian people.

If we oppose him today, we can expect to wander in the desert for 40 years. Our desert means hunger and lawlessness....

Extracts from the speech delivered by N. Natadze (the "Democratic Center" faction]We are against the dissolution of parliament. If Georgia remains without a parliament just for one day, this means that we will not have the legislative weapon to defend ourselves from the various attacks both from abroad and from within. We must first hold new elections to parliament that will then replace the old one....

It is known that there is currently a great shortage of qualifications and intellect but an even greater shortage of will, will on the part of the people to struggle for the future of Georgia. Therefore, it is unforgivable to see a lot of capable people unable to apply their skills. We must not lose people who possess will and even a little intelligence... Government representatives are obliged to go to them, ask them, do whatever is necessary to attract such people and not leave them on the street....

South Ossetian Situation Updated

OW0310130791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to reports from South Ossetia, an airfield of an army helicopter regiment came under fire in Zemo-Nikozi village outside Tskhinvali on Wednesday. One serviceman was wounded. The same day hostages taken by the Georgian and Ossetian sides on September 30 were exchanged. Meanwhile, the militia of neighbouring North Ossetia has announced that 55,576 Ossetian refugees have arrived in the republic from South Ossetia and other parts of Georgia.

Republic KGB Deputy Chairman Relieved of Duties

AU0310194991 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 18 Sep 91 p 3

[SAKINFORM report under rubric "Appointments and Dismissals"]

[Text] By a resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia, Zviad Mikhaylovich Bokuchava, as of 16 September 1991, has at his own request been released from the post of deputy chairman of the Committee for State Security of the Republic of Georgia.

Deputy Trade Minister Replaced

AU0310170491 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 21 Sep 91 p 2

[SAKINFORM report under the rubric "Appointments and Dismissals"]

[Text] By resolutions of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia:

Tamaz Shamuyelovich Moshiashvili has been appointed deputy minister of trade of the Republic of Georgia.

Nodar Shotayevich Mosulishvili has been released from the post of first deputy minister of trade of the Republic of Georgia at his own request.

Armenia

Ter-Petrosyan Heads Delegation to Kazakhstan

PM0310151991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Oct 91 p 2

[Untitled TASS report under general heading "Evening Teletype 1700-2400 Hours. Events"]

[Text] An official Armenian delegation headed by Supreme Soviet Chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan departed Yerevan for Alma-Ata yesterday. On an invitation from Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] President Nursultan Nazarbayev, the delegation will witness the launching at Baykonur of a spacecraft with a Kazakh cosmonaut aboard. Talks will take place about the future development of political and economic cooperation between the two republics.

Azerbaijan Seeking 'To Wreck' Mediation Process

LD0310191791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 3 Oct (TASS)— The Armenian Ministry of Internal Affairs has accused the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and USSR Ministry of Defense of "continuing to use armed forces in the actions carried out against the Armenian population of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and of the Shaumyanovskiy rayon" of Azerbaijan. It has protested resolutely over this matter.

The Armenian Ministry of Internal Affairs statement, which was distributed here today, states that military actions undertaken by the Azerbaijani side in the NKAO and the Shaumyanovksiy rayon of Azerbaijan were stepped up sharply from 22 to 30 September. Bearing in mind the statement made in Zheleznovodsk by the president of Azerbaijan, to the effect that he has complete control over all the armed formations in that republic, the Armenian Ministry of Internal Affairs considers that such actions "are to be assessed only as the failure of the Azerbaijani side to fulfill the agreements on the beginning of the negotiation process and on the stage by stage resolution of the NKAO problem, and as an attempt to wreck the results of the mediation mission undertaken by the presidents of Russia and Kazakhstan."

The statement also says that, despite the assurances by the top leadership of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the USSR Defense Ministry that their subunits are not taking part in the interethnic conflict and that they are carrying out observer functions only, and keeping the sides involved in the conflict apart, and despite the instructions given to that effect, "facts have been registered repeatedly attesting to unsanctioned violations of these instructions by the subunits of the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the USSR Defense Ministry".

Dwindling Fuel Reserves, Energy Shortage Noted

LD0310124191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1300 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Report by V. Nazaryan from Armenia; from the "TV Inform" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Nazaryan] Not a single tanker of fuel oil has been delivered to Armenia via the Azerbaijani railroad since 14 September. Fuel reserves at thermal electric power stations—they generate over 80 percent of all electric power in the republic—are dwindling with every passing day. To all appearances, a real power crisis is engulfing Armenia.

[S.G. Akopyan, chief engineer of the "Armglavenergo" plant] In connection with this, the republic has had to introduce all 10 phases of restrictions on industrial enterprises. Apart from that, all rayons will be switched off in turn for six hours every day.

[Nazaryan] There is enough power today only to somehow supply food industry enterprises, primarily bakeries, and to provide uninterrupted power to hospitals and maternity homes. This is today, but what will tomorrow bring? If fuel deliveries do not resume, the stocks will last...

[Akopyan, interrupting] Three days at the Razdan state regional electric power station and about 15 days at the Yerevan heat power stations.

[Nazaryan] It seems that forecasts of a difficult winter in Armenia are beginning to prove correct long before the cold weather has set in.

Azerbaijan

Mutalibov Holds Talks With Opposition Leaders

LD0310204991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Oct 91

[From the Vesti newscast]

[Text] After the return yesterday of [Azerbaijan] President Mutalibov to Baku from Kazakhstan and after a telephone conversation between him and the chairman of the Popular Front Majlis, the rally in front of the Supreme Soviet building ended peacefully, and an official meeting between the president of Azerbaijan and opposition leaders was scheduled for today. This meeting took place, and here is a resume of the meeting. [video shows demonstrators at rally; then Mutalibov shaking hands with opposition leaders at meeting]

[Begin recording] [Unidentified official] All the issues raised were met with understanding by the president. The president expressed the view that there is indeed a need to convene a special session of the Supreme Soviet and to consider all the matters raised by the opposition. [video cuts to Mutalibov being interviewed]

[Mutalibov] We spoke of several fundamental issues in respect of our joint activities—proceeding from our common interests and not, so to speak, from our differences.

[correspondent Fayad Makhush] Can one say that a consolidation was achieved?

[Mutalibov] Yes, I think a consolidation has been achieved.

[Makhush] At any rate, the very fact of direct talks between the president and the opposition is an event providing hope for a peaceful solution of many problems, and perhaps for elimination of mutual distrust. This is ANS correspondent Fayad Makhush for Vesti from the negotiations. [end recording]

Opposition Members Join Defense Council

PM0310143191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA roundup: "Azerbaijan President Ayaz Mutalibov Issues Decree on Creation of Republic Defense Council"]

[Text] The purpose of setting up the council is to safeguard Azerbaijan's security "against external aggression" (the reference is, evidently, primarily to Armenia). A. Mutalibov himself has taken charge of the Defense Council. In addition to him, opposition representatives have unexpectedly joined the Council, in particular Ragim Kaziyev, Ekhtibar Mamedov (People's Front), and Araz Ali-Zade (Social Democratic Party of Azerbaijan). Ekhtibar Mamedov said that when it is a question of national security "there should be no talk of opposition."

Reportage on Nagorno-Karabakh Clashes, Developments

Army 'Not Involved' in Shelling

OW0310130391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The commander of the First Army Lieutenant-General Sokolov has stated that army units are not involved in the shelling of Armenian villages. When asked how the Azeris happen to have armoured personnel carriers, he replied that back in 1989 the Azerbaijani Interior Ministry was provided with over 100 such vehicles. Besides, Azerbaijan is remaking trucks into such vehicles.

Following the sharp rise in hostilities in the conflict zone People's Deputy of the USSR from Nagorny Karabakh Zori Balaian has sent a telegram to the Presidents of the USSR and Russia as well as the Defence and Interior Ministers of the USSR saying that some 30 people have been killed and over 100 wounded and over 200 homes destroyed after the Zheleznovodsk understandings. He suggested confiscating all military vehicles from Azerbaijani black berets, including armoured vehicles, artillery, helicopters and tanks. Only on this condition the joint communique for Nagorny Karabakh can be carried out, the message says.

20 Killed Since Zheleznovodsk Accord

LD0410001291 Moscow TASS in English 2151 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert October 3 TASS—Twenty people have been killed in Nagorno-Karabakh over the ten days that have passed since a communique was signed in Zheleznovodsk by leaders of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Russia and Kazakhstan.

Five people were killed today in the Martuninskiy region, according to the reports from the Nagorno-Karabakh Interior Department.

No deliveries have been made to Nagorno-Karabakh through the Azerbaijanian railway since September 24, sources at the Stepanakert railway station told TASS.

It has become extremely difficult to provide the population with prime necessities. Director of the Stepanakert bread-baking plant Armen Martirosyan told TASS that only a day ration of flour is left in the city. Flour is not delivered to Nagorno-Karabakh because of the railway blockade.

Fuel supplies have run out as well: There is no public transportation, no gas even for ambulances or fire engines.

Grape gathering may be stopped because of fuel shortages. Only 25 per cent of the harvest have been collected, according to the Nagorno-Karabakh Agricultural Committee. At the same period of the last year, 50 per cent of the grape harvesting have been completed.

The blockade lifting in a two-week term was one of the conditions of the Zheleznovodsk communique. However, the blockade of Nagorno- Karabakh became tougher right on the day of the communique's signing.

Other provisions of the communique are not fulfilled either.

There are still no observers from the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan, who were to come to the area on October 1.

Deteriorating Living Conditions Noted

LD0410031991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0030 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Text] According to information from STUDINFORM agency, Khachaturian, assistant to the Armenian minister of internal affairs, has reported that in Shaumyanovskiy rayon, the epicenter of the military actions in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, an epidemic of jaundice has broken out among children.

For a week now, the fighting in the village of Karachinar has not ceased. It is being shelled with heavy artillery and missiles. There are wounded.

In a few days, a group of people's deputies from Russia is to set out for Baku and Stepanakert in connection with the accord signed in Zheleznovodsk on the settlement of the conflict.

(Zuri Balayan), Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast people's deputy, has sent telegrams to Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Nazarbayev, and Shaposhnikov, in which he points to the exacerbation of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, for which the Azerbaijani side is to blame. The people's deputy also drew attention to the incident of military equipment being observed on the Azerbaijani side which had been handed over by the Soviet Army and the internal troops.

Civilian, OMON Casualties Noted

OW0410003791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2023 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Nagorno-Karabakh's district center of Martuni bordering on the Azerbaijani village of Khodjavent, fire was opened from a passing army jeep on Thursday. Armenian residents returned the fire. As a result, one resident was killed and three others wounded. The news agency SNARK says a colonel of Azerbaijani OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] was killed and one more OMON commando wounded.

An armored vehicle arrived at the place shortly afterwards to open random fire. This resulted in yet another resident killed and one more wounded.

The Armenian-populated village of Karachinar in the Gheranboi (formerly Shaumyanovsk) district of Azerbaijan has continued to be the target of fire from armored personnel carriers and tanks, Armenian sources report.

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev on Alma-Ata Economic Meeting Results

OW0310125991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev has described as one of the main results of the top-level meeting of 13 republics in Alma-Ata the communique expressing determination to sign the economic treaty. In an interview for IF [INTERFAX] he stressed that all key aspects of the treaty were agreed upon: the formation of an international economic committee, an international economic council, a common court of arbitration, a common banking system, common strategic forces, the introduction of a common currency throughout the territory of the community and the coordination of foreign policies and foreign trade, etc.

Hence the economic treaty will be also a political document. "The fact that 12 republics declared their determination to sign it (some before November 15, others somewhat later) allows me to look into the future with optimism", Nazarbayev said. According to the Kazakh leader, only some clauses remain to be settled, but there should be no delay in the work. All mechanisms provided for by the economic treaty should be put to work in October-November this year. Nazarbayev emphasised that republics will be held responsible for violating supply agreements.

Speaking of the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, Nazarbayev said that the main task of the mediators at the meeting Zheleznovodsk was to bring all sides to the conflict to the negotiating table for the first time in four years.

"The problem cannot be simplified, he said, it is too old. It must be remembered that inter-ethnic differences are not settled overnight".

Nazarbayev recalled that among other things the Zheleznovodsk communique provides for a cease-fire following the arrival of observers in the conflict zone, but they have not arrived yet. Therefore one cannot say that the communique did not work.

The observers are likely to be sent this week. According to Nazarbayev there will be 20 of them: 5 from Kazakhstan, Russia, the Armenian and Azerbaijani parliaments respectively.

Trade Accords Signed With Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan

LD0310183791 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 3 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] At the Baykonyr launch site, meetings have taken place between Prime Minister Karamanov of Kazakhstan and Isanov and Gasanov, the prime ministers of Kyrgyzstan and Azerbaijan, respectively. A treaty was signed between Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan on reciprocal deliveries of the most important products and goods for the coming year. An agreement was also signed on the principles of trade and economic cooperation between Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan, which is to come into effect immediately.

Nazarbayev, Austrian Chancellor on Cooperation

LD0410022591 Moscow TASS in English 2036 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By KAZTAG-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulagin]

[Text] Alma-Ata October 3 TASS—Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev and Austrian Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky met in Baykonyr today after the launch of a Soviet spacecraft carrying an international crew, competent sources reported today.

The sides had a confidential friendly meeting on the results of the Alma-Ata negotiations between leaders of the 13 sovereign states.

The president and the chancellor noted with satisfaction that there are all grounds to say that the decision of the 12 of them to join the treaty on economic community, can be described as the first major step on the way of the Soviet Union's escape from the protracted sharp crisis.

Touching upon the successful beginning of the joint space mission on the Kazakh soil, Nazarbayev and Vranitzky stressed that it opens up new possibilities for the development of trade, economic, scientific, technological and cultural cooperation between Kazakhstan and Austria.

The sides mentioned specific ways to fulfill this cooperation.

Upon the completion of the meeting, Kazakh Prime Minister Uzakbay Karamanov and Austrian Vice Chancellor Erhard Busek, who took part in the conversation, signed a joint statement.

The statement confirms the sides' striving for the expansion of multi-faceted relations.

Semipalatinsk To Become Science, Production Center

PM0310152091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Oct 91 Union Edition p 8

[Report by A. Illesh: "Test Site Closed. Problems Begin"]

[Text] We have already reported the unprecedented decision by Kazakhstan President N. Nazarbayev, who issued a decree on the complete closure of the world's biggest nuclear test site—Semipalatinsk. It happened on 28 August, on the anniversary of the first explosion. What will happen now to the millions of hectares still surrounded by barbed wire? What will become of Kurchatov, a city that appears on no official map?

"The decree brought to an end the grim life of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site," Yevgeniy Chaykovskiy, chairman of the Kurchatov city soviet executive committee, said. "For the first time in the history of the ultramodern arms race the world's biggest test site has ceased to exist. No one in the world has ever before achieved such a thing in the antinuclear struggle."

But, and any expert of any note believes this, the local population's problems will sharply increase following the closure of the test site. Then comes a new step. The Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Cabinet of Ministers has approved a range of measures to turn the test site into a science and production center.

What does this mean in fact? Obviously, the transformation of the test site into a national economic facility, and moreover into a republic science and culture center—a task far more complex, in fact, than the closure of the giant nuclear center. The Cabinet of Ministers has decided on two courses of action. The first, to use the officialese, is the course of "administrative-government structures." The second course is social-parliamentary organizations.

Commissions have already been set up to analyze the state of the former test site's production and scientific potential, determine the advisability of the defense and national economic programs that operate here, and take stock of the resources that will be made available as a result of the end of the cessation of nuclear weapon tests and the reduction of the volume of defense programs... Finally, the borders of the test site will be reviewed, the status of the new territorial-administrative structure will be determined, and there will be an assessment of how much money is needed to maintain the life-support systems of the local capital—Kurchatov. This should result in a new—real!—program to turn the Semipalatinsk test site into a science and production complex.

The entire population of the city and of the closed region has been working for the defense industry for decades under a cloak of secrecy. A unique collective of specialists has been formed here. Now their future is in doubt. I believe that no matter how the situation develops it would be not only inhuman, but simply wasteful from the economic viewpoint to lose these people. But the situation in Kurchatov is extremely complex. The monopoly the military has had for decades of everything in the city (from housing construction to the supply of essential goods) is now gravely exacerbating what are already vexed questions...

Now for social-parliamentary actions. It has already been decided that there will be a week-long festival at the test site from 14 through 19 October, open to the media. Both Soviet and foreign journalists have been invited to Kurchatov. Yevgeniy Chaykovskiy also announced that he hoped leaders of states possessing nuclear weapons, scientists, businessmen, public figures, and politicians, people known for their contributions to the international antinuclear movement, would attend a press conference.

For the first time, the military and defense industry scientists are prepared to show their secrets to the world. As well as ultrasecret (I can confirm that the word is correct, because the author has been there) underground nuclear reactors, reporters will be shown unique archive footage and photographic documents and they will be taken to the site of the first explosion...

The purpose of this action is to focus the attention of the world's business circles on the solution of the test site's problems. Yevgeniy Chaykovskiy believes that the example of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site can show that all the tasks of the social protection of personnel and conversion of such a specialized production unit can be solved, given goodwill and a sensible approach.

Finally, at the end of November, a conference of city mayors from countries in the nuclear club and business people from all over the world will be held in Alma-Ata and Kurchatov. Its purpose will be to discuss the prospects for turning the nuclear test site into a center for science and culture.

There are four nuclear test sites left in the world...for now. The Semipalatinsk experience could become truly international—after all, these four will have to close sooner or later.

Kyrgyzstan

UN Experts To Issue Recommendations on Economy

OW0410001091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A group of experts of the UN Economic and Social Commission on Asia and the Pacific will carry out independent checks next month of the economic situation in Kyrgyzstan and issue recommendations on the possible shift of economic development priorities in the republic. IF's [INTERFAX] reporter learned this from Rana Vera, the commission's senior official who spent the past week in Bishkek.

According to Mr. Vera, if Kyrgyzstan is ever to be economically independent, it should shift the main accent from agriculture and raw materials towards the manufacture of end products. As he gathered from talks with republican leaders, Kyrgyzstan is clearly interested

in expert advice on how to reorganize its finance and tax policies and in obtaining international assistance in the form of personnel training.

Akayev Promises 'Freedom of Conscience' Bill

OW0410001991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2023 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] No economic, political, or social problems could be solved unless firm moral principles were established in the consciousness of the people, said Askar Akayev, president of Kyrgyzstan, during his meeting with member of the Muslim clergy in the town of Jalalabad today.

An IF [INTERFAX] correspondent reports that Mr Akayev promised that a freedom of conscience bill would be submitted to the next session of the Kyrgyzstan Parliament.

Mr Akayev also said he was prepared to give his support to any plans to build new mosques and set up madrasas (religious colleges). In the President's opinion, "adherence to the immortal moral commandments of the Koran will help Muslims in Kyrgyzstan solve their everyday problems".

Law on Local Self Government

91US0728A

[Text] For this law published in the 29 May 1991 SLOVO KYRGYZSTANA, see the FBIS Report Soviet Union: Republic Affairs, FBIS-USR-91-031, dated 17 September 1991, pp 40-53.

Law on Environmental Protection

91WN0681Z

[Text] For this law published in the 21 May 1991 SLOVO KYRGYZSTANA, see the FBIS Report Soviet Union: Republic Affairs, FBIS-USR-91-033, dated 24 September 1991, pp 30-37.

Tajikistan

Supreme Soviet Extraordinary Session Concludes

Rejects Nabiyev Resignation

LD0310221291 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Text] An extraordinary session of the Tajik Supreme Soviet has ended in Dushanbe. It turned down the demands of the opposition concerning the resignation of Rakhman Nabiyev, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. The issue of legalizing the unregistered Islamic Revival Party was postponed till the next session. The proposal of a deputy to hold a referendum on confidence in the acting parliament did not win support.

Earlier, the parliament suspended the activities of the Tajik Communist Party to investigate the degree of its involvement in the August coup. Meanwhile, thousands of opposition members are continuing to rally outside the parliament building, insisting on their demands.

Suspends Communist Party

LD0410013791 Moscow TASS in English 2257 GMT 3 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Galina Gridneva]

[Text] Dushanbe, October 4 TASS—The Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan, the [as received] Central Asia, today closed its extraordinary session.

The session has decided to suspend the activities of the Tajik Communist Party and its successor until the party's participation in the coup attempt is estimated—the issue that provoked tension in the republic.

After short but heated debates, the session by the majority of votes rejected the opposition's demands that chairman of the Tajik Supreme Soviet Rakhmon Nabiyev resign for the period of presidential pre-election campaign, which is to end on October 27, and that republican procurator Nurullo Khuvaidullayev resign as well.

The issue of the "legalisation" of the unregistered Islamic Party of Revival has been postponed until the next session.

The meeting adopted appeals of the Tajik Supreme Soviet to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, parliaments of the sovereign republics and the world community.

The later stressed, in particular, that "the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan declares its adherence to the ideas of democratic progress, and the declaration of rights and freedoms, adopted at the fifth extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies."

"The Supreme Soviet declares its determination to oppose political extremism and any attempts to achieve political goals by non-democratic means."

The central square of Dushanbe is still full of people who are trying to make the authorities fulfill all opposition demands.

Rejects Demand To Disband

LD0410111991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1000 GMT 4 Oct 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The session of the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet has ended in Dushanbe. Deputies refused to comply with the opposition's demands for the Supreme Soviet chairman's resignation and for self-disbandment. According to some reports, the rally at the Supreme Soviet building continues in Dushanbe.

Workers Support Supreme Soviet

LD0410093191 Dushanbe Radio Dushanbe Network in Tajik 0005 GMT 4 Oct 91

[Text] A meeting was held in Kolyab in support of the Supreme Soviet and the constitution of the Republic of Tajikistan. More than 1,000 workers from the center of the Oblast, representing enterprises and institutions of the city, expressed objections to the demonstrators and hunger strikers on Ozodi Square.

Participants at the meeting demanded that the protracted gathering in Ozodi Square should end quickly and that the Supreme Soviet of the republic should justly and (?honestly) resolve the issue of the Communist Party of Tajikistan and its successor. Drivers at the motor transport enterprise took strike action in support of the constitution and Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Tajikistan.

Turkmenia

Democratic Party Official Opposes Referendum

OW0210133891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1145 GMT 2 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The referendum on the independence of Turkmenia later this month is senseless, it will be simply a waste of time and money. This is the opinion of a co-chairman of the Turkmen Democratic Party Durdy Murad Hoja-Muhammed. In his opinion the farming of Turkmenia is now more dependent on the industries of Russia and the other republics of the Union than they are on it.

From the viewpoint of foreign affairs independence is also senseless, because all the neighbouring republics have proclaimed their sovereignty.

If it does not hold the referendum, the party leader stressed, the republic will be able to establish more active contacts with Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, Arab and other countries without disrupting economic ties with members of the former Union.

Indebture, Reserves, Resources Discussed

PM0310085791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 91 Single Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent M. Volkov: "Entering the Market With an Empty Purse. Why a Republic Rich in Resources Is on the Brink of Bankruptcy"]

[Text] Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]—"Minus 2 billion." That, Finance Minister A. Bayramov said with bitter irony, is the unreal sum that the industrious sovereign republic of Turkmenia has to its name as it enters the free market. The figure is in rubles, but the republic could issue dinars or tumans, which were in circulation before the October Revolution. Initially at least, in quantities sufficient to pay wages and compensation.

"Many reputable people have suggested that we start to print our own national currency," D. Bayramov, director of the Turkmen SSR State Planning Committee Economics Research Institute, said. "But it is not really practicable, I am afraid. Our own currency would certainly have to be backed up by gold, and we have none."

Opponents of this economist, who is well known in Central Asia, believe that Turkmenia's main resources—oil, gas, and cotton—are a substantial gold reserve. Some estimate that its gas alone—if sold at world prices—could add $13 billion to the treasury each year, while others put the figure at $9.5 billion, a very impressive amount. But this immediately prompts the sobering question: Who will buy this gas for hard currency? Neither Uzbekistan, nor Tajikistan, nor the Ukraine will pay in dollars. And the foreign neighbors—Afghanistan and Iran—are not averse to selling their own natural gas.

The questions remain unanswered. But we grow excellent cotton, my interlocutors suddenly remember. It is priceless! The whole trouble is that it does have a price, Ch. Karryyev, deputy chairman of the Turkmen SSR State Planning Committee, says, dampening their enthusiasm. And he contends on the basis of serious research that Turkmenia's cotton, wool, karakul, and silk cocoons will not produce the expected bumper profits. The transition to world prices will make leading sectors of the republic's underdeveloped industry—machine building and the chemical industry—reliant on subsidies.

Yes, Turkmenia has been driven into an almost hopeless situation by the administrative edict system. For decades it was required to produce cotton and nothing else. The single crop system has driven out almost everything that used to be grown on these arable lands. The once famous bazaars overflowing with fruits, vegetables, and the sweetest melons and watermelons have fallen into decline.

To give the republic's leaders their due, they have taken desperate measures in recent years to extricate the economy from its deep crisis. Plans and state orders for the sale of cotton fiber have been overfulfilled four years in succession.

While increasing the yield per hectare, Turkmenia has begun to replace the single crop system and is using the land thereby made available to grow grain and feed. The number of public sector livestock has begun to grow. Nevertheless, the republic has not been able to restructure its economy and is now clearly on unequal terms at the start of market relations.

But it is too early to give way to pessimism. Turkmenia managed to secure some hard currency payments for its gas—approximately $70 million. And President S. Niyazov flew immediately to Italy, where important agreements were reached. The Italians are going to build a powerful textile combine in Ashkhabad, and there are plans to build a gas processing complex in Chardzhou. And Turkmenia has finally secured the legal right to fish in its own territorial waters in the Caspian Sea.

But much is still unclear, particularly those 2 billion rubles [R]. Economists claim that the exchange of goods has always been unequal. The republic has received R2 billion less than its due, and that amount has been returned here in the form of subventions from the Union.

Turkmenia will no longer tolerate the squandering of valuable raw materials at a fraction of their worth. It has reached the point where government level discussions are taking place on foreign firms' proposals to lay a gas pipeline to the Persian Gulf via Iran. A highway and railroad to Iran are already being built.

The question of customs is also being studied. This has cropped up, so to speak, in connection with exports, which, according to competent bodies, have greatly intensified. No special research is required in this connection, however. Law enforcement bodies are constantly reporting attempts to export large consignments of furniture, clothing, and food from the republic—which still does not have coupons, tokens, or ration cards—to the Baltic, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and so forth.

Financial experts are in favor of the immediate nationalization of banks, and with good reason. Judge for yourselves: For some reason, citizens' savings, which amount to R2.2 billion, are kept in Union safes rather than in Turkmenia.

Scientists are unanimous that it is essential to restructure the education system as soon as possible. Academician R. Bayramov, for example, has publicly remarked on the very low standard of intellectual work and scientific and technical progress. In his opinion, if the doors were opened to Russian and foreign business, the majority of cadres would be treated as unskilled laborers because of their poor training. However, as A. Babayev, president of the Academy of Sciences, has repeatedly stressed, the work of Turkmen scientists is in no way inferior to that of their foreign counterparts. The problem is that it is not utilized in the republic itself.

In short, a very rich republic has been reduced to bankruptcy. But, after meeting its leaders, scientists, and specialists and observing the life of its unpretentious, industrious people, I am optimistic. I am sure that Turkmenia will very soon get back on its feet and occupy a worthy, fitting place not only in the economic union but in the world economy as a whole.

Regulations Simplified at Border With Iran

OW0410001191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 3 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The first checkpoint using simplified border regulations has opened near Gaudan-Pachkyran at Turkmenia's border with Iran. Any resident from the 45-kilometer border zone may travel to the neighboring country 4 times a year for no more than 15 days each time, or may invite guests from Iran.

Invitation from, or the exact address of the host party in Iran is nevertheless a "must" as is permission from the border zone leadership and police.

The new border checkpoint is so far in operation two days a week and lets no more than 50 people into and out of the country daily. In the near future the passage of travellers through it will increase, and 5 more such checkpoints will open at the Turkmeno-Iranian border.

Uzbekistan

Legislators Split on No Confidence Measure

LD0210113791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1000 GMT 2 Oct 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] KURANTY correspondent Valeriy Volodin reports a split in the Uzbek Supreme Soviet. About 200 deputies expressed no confidence in republican President Karimov and announced the formation of an opposition headed by Uzbek Vice President Mirsaidov. Meetings attended by many thousands of people continue in Andizhan and Namangan oblasts, demanding the resignation of Karimov and a ban on the Communist Party, currently called the Socialist Party. The republican mass media have not said a word about the continued unrest.

Karimov Deliberates Implications of Independence

PM0210154691 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 30 Sep 91 p 7

[Interview with Uzbek President Islam Karimov by Editor-in-Chief 'Uthman al-'Umayr in Tashkent; date not given]

[Excerpts] [introductory passage omitted] The moment we sat down to talk the president said: "I want to say a few words. Although this meeting came about by chance, I am pleased to be giving my first newspaper interview since the proclamation of independence, especially with the editor-in-chief of an Arab daily such as AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT.

The Middle East is close to our region, and we always remember that we are an Islamic Asian state close to the Islamic world.

The stormy events sweeping the Soviet Union, East Europe, and Europe in general give the impression that perestroyka in the Soviet Union is taking place only in Moscow, Leningrad (now St. Petersburg), and other cities, as though what is happening in the Asian part is completely out of the picture. But those in Moscow and the world who understand matters realize the important role which the Asian republics, including Uzbekistan, can play.

Some people had the impression during Soviet rule that Uzbekistan was an obedient country and that its inhabitants were also obedient and willing to implement Moscow's orders. Overconfidence within the Moscow leadership caused it to regard us as a source for raw materials, silk, and cotton from 1965. That situation did not change after the October revolution. In fact there is a view that Uzbekistan is the fortress of communism, but anyone who investigates the history of communism will receive a totally different picture. This, because everything here used to be suppressed by military force. They tried to plant the idea that we should express our gratitude and thanks for what is given to us.

I have every reason for saying that we have a Communist Party but only a few people believe in the Marxist, Leninist, and communist ideas.

We have the national accord, political stability, and the national cultural accord. They are trying to portray this as the result of the Communist Party's pressure.

We have recently announced a freeze on the Communist Party's activities, the formation of a new party, and the approval of new changes. I announced openly at the party's 28th congress that our party is a new party and completely independent of the Soviet Communist Party. And that its charter and program do not belong to the center. Since this issue has now been settled, we are proceeding honorably with, and totally taking care of, the party's program decided last year.

We are against actions such as those of Communist Party leader Mikhail Gorbachev, which were characterized by confusion when he announced his relinquishment of the post of secretary general, which he had no right to do, either on the basis of the party's charter or on any other basis.

We are pursuing another path in order to achieve that which we have long sought to achieve.

Furthermore, 99 percent of communists support the decree proclaiming Uzbekistan's independence. If we consider the people's reaction, it must be said that the great majority of people support the proclamation. The dream of the Uzbeks and those who live in Uzbekistan has for centuries been to obtain independence in order to realize their aspirations. The time when we used to do everything at Moscow's instructions is over. The instructions of administrative communism or barracks communism have gone, and so has monopolism.

[Excerpts] [Karimov continues] What are we going to do? The independence decree is merely a piece of paper. So we must translate words into deeds. We must from now on work and take the measures to guarantee the attainment of real independence. The West and world radio stations expect independence to lead us to disaster. At one point they said the same with regard to the Baltic republics.

Our population is more than double that of the three Baltic republics combined. Our economic capabilities are much greater than theirs. We provide one-third of the Soviet Union's gold, 65 percent of its cotton crop, 67 percent of its natural silk, and 70 percent of natural fur in the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

[Al-'Umayr] What is the party's future, especially since you have been late in dissolving it?

[Karimov] I can repeat to you that we have members in the party who adhere to the concept of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, but, as I said earlier, they are few. Our people believe in the example of socialism, which means brotherhood, equality, mutual help, and social protection. That is, whatever is associated with guarantees and facilities. And in truth, we have moved away from that, since for 70 years we have brought up people who lived off the state and who expected a great deal from it, while they did nothing for the sake of their earnings. We are moving toward a the market economy, and that is the kind of transactions we want. But in the transitional period we reject shock treatments. We are against the ideas that Yavlinskiy is promoting today. I liken the present situation in Uzbekistan to the situation in India. It must be said that a large number of inhabitants here live in poverty. Unless we protect the lower groups in terms of social prosperity and national income, and unless we guarantee their minimum needs, there will never be a market economy in our country. [passage omitted]

[Al-'Umayr] Will you set up a strong modern army?

[Karimov] We cannot, since we have signed the agreement on collective security. This agreement alone which can guarantee the small republic's security. This is everyone's opinion. We do not need a huge military capability, the exception being the national guard which we will form. We are moving toward regional confederalism so that Central Asia and Kazakhstan can participate in collective security with all the republics, including the strong republics. In the treaty discussed recently by the congress all the republics, including those that have obtained independence, raised this idea. Our decision is based not on emotions, but on rational, practical calculations.

We lean more toward the confederal formula. Russia alone without the republics will not be attractive to the other nationalities and republics. We have all been worried by Yeltsin's statement after the coup concerning the demarcation of borders with the Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan. We view Yeltsin within the context of the Soviet Union and cannot view him from that angle alone.

As for the options in the event of an election, I will talk about that when the date approaches. [passage omitted]

Defense Minister Interviewed on Republic Army

PM0210105591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Sep 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Colonel R.U. Akhmedov, Uzbek minister for defense affairs and commander of the National Guard, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA editorial board; place and date not given: "Republic of Uzbekistan: We Have Common Interests"]

[Text] In a previous feature we reported that the minister for defense affairs—Colonel R. Akhmedov, commander of the National Guard—had taken up his post in the Republic of Uzbekistan. At the request of the editorial board he answered several questions.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Rustam Urmanovich, a republic Ministry for Defense Affairs has been set up in Uzbekistan. What are its functions. Is this not the start of the process of forming a republic army?

[Akhmedov] The Uzbek Ministry for Defense Affairs, which has just been set up, assumes an obligation to protect the republic's state sovereignty, to prepare young people for service in the National Guard and the Armed Forces, and to ensure legal and social protection for servicemen and members of their families. A republic army is a fabrication. It is simply inappropriate to speak of creating one. Uzbekistan advocates the country's unified Armed Forces. It would also be incorrect to say that the republic has claims on the Turkestan Military District. It is another matter that a mutual agreement will be reached between the district leadership and the Ministry for Defense Affairs on questions of ensuring the troops' life and activity and on defining the territory and time for holding exercises. Further, there will be an accord on questions of relocating the troops on the territory of Uzbekistan, proceeding from the republic's interests. Particularly on the protection of natural riches and material resources. In short, we reckon on business-like relations and close cooperation with the Turkestan Military District.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] In addition, the functions of the Ministry for Defense Affairs will, as is known, include the organization of service outside the troops—alternative service. But, in order for the Ministry for Defense Affairs to fulfill the entire package of what is planned, a corresponding material-technical base is also needed, is it not?

[Akhmedov] Undoubtedly. The ministry has been created on the basis of the republic military commissariat, the republic civil defense staff, the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy, and the special nontroop service administration, as well as the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry troops stationed on the territory of Uzbekistan.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] According to a decree of the president of the Republic of Uzbekistan, you are also commander of the National Guard. In what form will the newly created armed formation appear?

[Akhmedov] The manning and functioning of the National Guard fall within the competence of the republic Ministry for Defense Affairs. The National Guard's chief task is to stand guard over the sovereignty, state flag, and constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan and also to guard particularly important state installations of republic significance.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Obviously representatives of the indigenous nationality will become guardsmen, will they not?

[Akhmedov] This is an extremely incorrect viewpoint. We are now deciding the question that the National Guard will be manned by representatives of various nationalities, by citizens of sovereign Uzbekistan. A guardsman, regardless of nationality, must be a patriot of the republic. But, in manning subunits, account will undoubtedly be taken of the percentage composition of the population living in Uzbekistan.

In addition, the National Guard will be a reserve of the USSR Armed Forces. Therefore not only republic but also Union structures must be interested in its instruction and professional training.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Rustam Urmanovich, the next, fall draft into the Armed Forces is not far off. What, in your view, will it be like in the republic?

[Akhmedov] We will, of course, select the very best people for the republic National Guard through the drafting centers of organs of local military management. We will provide the percentage of draftees that exists in the treaty between the republic and the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

Production Slump Hits One-Third of Enterprises

OW0310043491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2254 GMT 2 Oct 91

[From the "Soviet Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Over the eight months of 1991, ⅓ of enterprises in Uzbekistan, Central Asia, produced less than last year, reports republican statistics committee.

The total shortfall in industrial production is 1.890 bn. Rbs. [billion rubles]. The republic is getting less variety in industrial goods, and major factories in the republic are idle for longer periods of time than last year because of disrupted economic ties and upset delivery schedules.

Production of paper dropped 16%, of chemical fibres, 10%, power transformers, 17%, sulphuric acid, 22%, and rolled steel, 19%.

Grain Exports Contribute to Bread Shortage

OW0310051991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2254 GMT 2 Oct 91

[From the "Soviet Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Though bakeries work as usual, Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan, has difficulties supplying its population with bread. According to the local press, there are problems because grain is being exported to the neighbouring republics as Uzbekistan refused to follow the example of the other Soviet republics and raise the price of bread.

But according to the Uzbek Trade Ministry, more bread is consumed because of the shortage of other foodstuffs.